

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'I AM at present on the Epistle to the Hebrews. The great difference of such a subject from all others is that all the interests of Time and Eternity are wrapped up in it. The scrutiny of a title-deed to £100,000 a year is nothing to it. How should it be? Is there a Christ? Is He the Heir of all things? Was He made flesh? Did He offer the all-perfect sacrifice? Did He supersede the old order of priests? Is He the Mediator of a new and better Covenant? What are the terms of that Covenant? There are no questions like these. They raise, in their very investigation, the whole soul into the Empyrean. All other interests seem low, trivial, petty, momentary. I am astonished, too, at the imperative tone of this Epistle, and the element of holy scorn against those who refused to go into these great questions carefully. The Voice seems to shake the heavens and the earth in order to establish in the hearts of the obedient the kingdom that cannot be moved.'

These words are quoted from the Letters of James SMETHAM. They are quoted, as motto and as motive, at the beginning of a new exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is an exposition which has been made by the Rev. J. Grange RADFORD, B.D., and published with the title of *The Eternal Inheritance* (Kelly; 5s. net). Whether the title came from James SMETHAM or from the

Epistle to the Hebrews, Mr. RADFORD does not tell us, and it does not matter. What does matter is that the Epistle to the Hebrews has made the same impression upon this young scholar as it made upon the well-tried painter. It is as the face which looks out from some of the old pictures. The eyes follow us wherever we go. So however time passes and new questions arise, this wonderful Epistle, untarnished by time, is ready with its sufficient answer.

What are the questions of our day? There is, for one question, the religious finality of the Christian revelation. 'The comparative study of the world's religions has forced this truth into prominence. The discovery, in some of them, of religious ideas of a high order, and of moral precepts of lofty tone, demands that the primacy of the truths that inhere in Christ, and radiate from Him, be exhibited. This is the very nerve of all foreign missionary propaganda. Of all the pressing tasks that lie to the hand of the Church to-day, none is more urgent than to maintain, with reason and persuasion, that Jesus Christ is the supreme and final authority for men in religion. Not the religion of Jesus Christ, *i.e.* the religion which He felt and practised, nor the Christian religion as it has been interpreted and proclaimed in any age of the Church's changeful history, but the religion which has its essence in the death and the claims

of Jesus Christ, must be maintained to be final and absolute.'

This is the very topic of the Epistle to the Hebrews. This is the writer's reason for taking his pen in hand. Who the writer was, we do not know. Mr. RADFORD is convinced it was not St. Paul. The careful study of the Epistle undertaken for this exposition has quite convinced him that Pauline authorship, in whole or in part, is impossible. Nor does he think it was the work of any of the others whose names have been associated with it — Silas, Barnabas, Luke, Apollos, Priscilla and Aquila, or Clement of Rome. But whoever wrote it, this is why he wrote. He anticipated the chief religious interest of the twentieth century, and wrote to prove that Jesus Christ is first and final.

There is also the question of the real humanity of Jesus Christ. Here again the aid of the Epistle to the Hebrews is very timely. Not that we are in danger of denying Christ's humanity. We believe in the humanity only too exclusively. What this Epistle does for us is to help us to interpret that humanity. For 'it has become necessary' (we quote Mr. RADFORD again) 'to attempt, with much caution and reverence, to mark out the limitations of power and of knowledge into which the Eternal Son entered when He took upon Himself the nature of man. For this supremely delicate work this epistle affords much timely aid, in that the writer deals with the life of Jesus on earth as really and morally human. He supplements the presentation of Jesus which is found in the four Gospels, not by giving further biographical details, but by suggesting certain ethical and religious principles by which His experience and vocation were shaped. Reverently to trace his suggestions towards their issues makes the living Saviour, who now works for men beyond the limitations of this earthly sphere, seem not less divine, and much more human, than otherwise He appears.'

Once more, there is the question of the Atone-

ment. That question is vital always. Nothing gives the unbeliever more astonishment than its persistence. It is the 'short argument' for Christianity. At the present time our chief concern is whether the Atonement offered by Christ affected the attitude of God to sinners or only the attitude of sinners to God. 'Nine-tenths of the modern books on the Atonement,' says Professor STALKER, 'are occupied with its effects on the mind of men, but nine-tenths of the Bible statements are concerned with its effects on the mind of God.' The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is greatly concerned with the effect of Christ's death on the mind of God. 'He labours to show how the sacrifice which Christ offered meets the exacting demands of God's holiness, and enables Him graciously to supply to even the most obdurate of impenitent hearts the influences of grace which may move it to repentance and righteousness.'

Yet again, we are concerned in our day with the life of Christ after He left the earth. The reality of the heavenly life has been denied by the denial of the resurrection from the dead. But it is essential to the Christian faith. And, when forgotten, it has a way of returning and asserting its reality—sometimes, as in the case of Dr. DALE, so as to shake the life to its very foundations. The Epistle to the Hebrews was written by one who never for a moment forgot the ascended Christ. It was written by one who was able by faith and thought to follow Him into the spiritual order and offer us transporting glimpses of His high-priestly work within the veil.

Last of all, Mr. RADFORD finds it necessary to-day, as it seems to have been necessary in the day when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, to affirm 'the immediate holiness of the accepted penitent.' Here there is a difference in language between this Epistle and the Epistles of St. Paul. Both recognize the priority of acceptance over good works. Both assert that it is not for any merit of ours that we are accepted of God, but

solely on account of the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Both insist upon betterment of life and conduct following the acceptance. But that new relation into which the returning sinner enters with God through Christ is called by St. Paul 'justification,' while by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews it is called 'sanctification.'

Professor George MILLIGAN of the University of Glasgow, and his fellow-workers among the papyri, have made the language of the New Testament a subject of very great interest. And the interest in the language has been reflected upon all the literary questions which surround the writing and distribution of the New Testament books. The time is ripe therefore for the offering of a popular survey of the whole field, and Professor MILLIGAN is the man to offer it. He took this subject when appointed Croall lecturer for 1911-12, and now the lectures are published under the title of *The New Testament Documents, their Origin and Early History* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

The lectures are six in number. Their subjects are: (1) The Original Manuscripts of the New Testament; (2) the Language of the New Testament Writings; (3) the Literary Character of the Epistles and Apocalypse; (4) the Literary Character of the Gospels and Acts; (5) the Circulation of the New Testament Writings; and (6) the Collection of the New Testament Writings. All these are topics with which the student of the New Testament is very familiar, but in this book every one of them is approached by a fresh mind and has fresh light thrown upon it from recent discovery and decipherment.

The new interest began with the decipherment of the papyri. Not with their discovery. It is true that GRENfell and HUNT have added enormously to the pile of papyri available. But the earliest papyrus discoveries in Egypt were made as long ago as 1778, and since the middle of last century quite a number of documents have been

lying in Turin, London, Leyden, and Paris waiting for the patient genius of the decipherer and linguist.

'Full of varied significance,' says Dr. MILLIGAN, 'as many of these documents were, they evoked comparatively little interest even amongst palaeographers and historians, while their bearing upon the Greek of the Biblical writings passed practically unnoticed. The earliest hint in this direction that I have been able to discover is afforded by a passage in Peyron's Introduction to his edition of the Turin Papyri in 1826, in which he states that in order to understand the meaning of some of their unusual words, he had consulted "the contemporary writers, especially the translators of the LXX, the writers of the New Testament, Polybius, and Aristaeas." But no one seems to have thought of reversing the process, and of examining the papyri for illustrations of LXX or New Testament Greek.'

'It was left,' he says later, 'to Adolf Deissmann, now Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Berlin, to write as a Privatdozent at Marburg, and to publish as a pastor at Herborn, the *Bibelstudien*, first issued in 1895, and followed by the *Neue Bibelstudien* in 1897, which were virtually to inaugurate a new movement in the linguistic study of our Greek Bible. The two volumes are combined in the English translation by the Rev. A. Grieve under the title *Bible Studies*, contributions chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity, 2nd ed., Edinburgh, 1903.'

The most visible result of this study has been to silence for ever the old controversy between the Purists and the Hebraists—the Purists, who endeavoured to bring all the peculiarities of New Testament Greek under the strict rules of Attic usage; and the Hebraists, who magnified these peculiarities in the interests of a

distinctively 'Biblical Greek,' or even 'language of the Holy Ghost.' It is now a settled matter that the New Testament writers made use of the ordinary Greek of their own time, and that, too, in its more vulgar or colloquial form.

Are there, then, no Hebraisms in the language of the New Testament? Dr. MILLIGAN does not say so. On the contrary, he gently rebukes 'the over-eagerness which many advocates of the new light display in getting rid of the "Hebraisms" or "Semitisms," which have hitherto been regarded as a distinguishing feature of the Greek New Testament.' It is impossible, he says, to remove genuine 'Semitisms' from the New Testament altogether, or to the extent that is sometimes demanded. And he sees no reason for undue anxiety to do so. 'The presence of a few "Semitisms" more or less does not prevent our recognising that the general language of the document in which they occur is Greek, any more than the Scotticisms, into which a North Briton shows himself so ready to fall, exclude the possibility that all the time he is doing his best to talk English.' And it is surely wiser to attribute these Semitic-seeming words and constructions at once to their natural source, more especially when they occur in circumstances which make their presence not only explicable but inevitable.

And not only are there Hebraisms still, there are still some examples of 'Biblical Greek.' For what else does Sir W. M. RAMSAY mean when, in his recent defence of the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, he argues that 'the marked change of language and the number of new words' which these Epistles exhibit is due to the fact that St. Paul had to 'create' a new terminology to correspond with the new ecclesiastical situation with which he found himself confronted? 'Many of his new words,' says RAMSAY, 'are the brief expression of something which in his earlier letters he describes as a process, but which had now become so common a phenomenon in the practical management of a congregation that it demanded a

special name.' And he instances by way of illustration the very first peculiar word that occurs in them, 'to teach a different doctrine' (1 Ti 1⁸), whose occurrence to describe a danger that had become very pressing in the early Church he regards as 'not only not un-Pauline,' but as 'thoroughly true to Paul's mind and character.'

It has been said that one of the things necessary for a great biography is an abundance of materials. The materials for the Life of Christ before He came into the world are not abundant. Perhaps that is why this biography has so rarely been written. Yet they are sufficient. They come partly from Christ Himself and partly from His disciples.

Christ Himself certainly knew that He had lived before He came into the world. Wordsworth says:

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
The Soul that rises with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar.

But Wordsworth, even as a poet, does not mean that which Christ meant when He spoke of His pre-earthly life. Nor had He forgotten the nature of it. And no doubt He would have said more about it than He did, if it had not been that He was occupied with His life on earth and that it was not possible to say much about the previous life that could have been understood.

He was occupied with His life and work on earth. He had come into the world for a special purpose, with a definite work to do. That work was of a most absorbing nature. What His thoughts were before He began His public ministry we cannot tell. But from that moment His ministry was all His concern. He had come, He said, to seek and to save the lost. That word 'lost' carried a meaning for Him that we only

faintly see afar. That it would cost Him something to save the 'lost,' He knew even from the first. But He never flinched from the task; He never allowed any other interest for one moment to interfere with it.

And not only was He too much occupied with His work on earth to say much about His previous life, but He knew that His followers would not have understood Him had He told them about that life. It was difficult to get them to understand so much as He did tell them. His closest followers were slow of heart to believe what the prophets had spoken even about His earthly life. And when to the people He so much as hinted that He had been before He came into the world, saying, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' they took up stones to stone Him.

But if Christ did not Himself say much about His life before He came into the world, what He said was without dubiety. And His disciples were just as free from doubt. This is a surprising thing. What is said in the Acts of the Apostles, or in any of the Epistles, about the pre-earthly life of Christ is said quite incidentally, not as a matter which required proof, but as a matter which, being itself certain, could be used in proof or illustration of other things. Does St. Paul wish to commend liberality in giving? 'For ye know,' he says, 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor.' Does he wish to encourage humility? 'Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.'

But in truth the amount of material is of less consequence than the quality of it. The great difficulty is to know what to reject, and what to accept. And yet there are two tests. Whatever is said about the life of Christ before He came into the world must commend itself as in harmony with

His life in the world, and it must be accepted by scholars as actually having the meaning and the reference attributed to it.

It must be acknowledged by scholars as having the meaning attributed to it, and as referring to the pre-earthly life of our Lord. Take an example. There is a passage in the Apocalypse (13⁸) which is commonly supposed to have to do with that life, but about the meaning of which there is some dispute, and it may have to be set aside. The words, according to the Revised Version, are: 'And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, every one whose name hath not been written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world.' According to that translation the Lamb of God is said to have been slain from the foundation of the world. And the passage may be used as stating that the purpose of God to redeem the world was formed, not only before sin entered into it, but even from its very creation. But the *margin* of the Revised Version offers a different order of the words. There the translation suggested is 'every one whose name hath not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain.' And this translation is on the whole preferred by the most careful scholarship of the day.

The other test is that whatever is said of the life of Christ *before* must be consistent with what we know of His life *after* He came into the world. For if there is one thing more axiomatic than another to the writers of the New Testament, it is that the Incarnation did not alter the nature of the Lord Jesus Christ. If, therefore, He was ever angry on earth, He must be capable of anger in heaven. If His heart went out to the far country with the prodigal, He is merciful and gracious always. If He reasoned with Nicodemus, He has from the beginning been saying, Come now and let us reason together. He must be found in the pre-earthly life the same as He who on earth

Took the brown little babes in the holy
White hands of the Saviour of men ;
Held them close to His heart and caressed them,
Put His face down to theirs as in prayer,
Put their hands to His neck, and so blessed
them,
With baby hands hid in His hair.

Well, the first thing that we learn about Jesus Christ before He came into the world is that He had a home. He had no home on earth. Mary and Joseph, we may believe, did their best to make a home for Him in His youth. But they did not understand. And after that there was no home possible for Him. 'He went about through all their cities and villages teaching'—you cannot make a home by wandering. And however He might come back from time to time to Capernaum, He came with Judas Iscariot. He could not have a home where Judas lived. If the presence of Judas troubled Him at the Last Supper table, it troubled Him at every meal. But, indeed, He said plainly enough, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests ; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' And yet how He would have valued a home on earth if He could have had it. How much it would have meant to Him. When some one said once to a persecuted follower of His that he wondered how he could be so serene in the face of daily misrepresentation, 'Oh, man !' was the answer, 'I am happy at home.'

But He had a home before He came to earth, and there was not one jarring element in it. The phrase He used to describe it is singularly beautiful. 'No man,' He said, 'hath seen God at any time ; the only begotten Son, *which is in the bosom of the Father*, he hath declared him.' We speak of those whom we hold dear on earth as 'going home' when they leave us. Jesus spoke of one as 'carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.' It is the same word that is used when it is said that a certain disciple 'leaned on Jesus' breast.' The home to which they go who fall asleep in Jesus is the bosom of the Father : 'That where I

am, there ye may be also.' The home which Christ had before He came into the world was a home that was made by mutual love.

The inmates of the home were Father and Son. We speak not now of the Holy Spirit. Now we are writing the biography of the Son before He came into the world. Let us keep our thoughts fixed upon the Father and the Son.

The name of Father as applied to God is very familiar to us. We are not so familiar with the name of Son as applied to Christ. And yet it was the Sonship of Christ that gave us the Fatherhood of God. Jesus had much to say of the Father, but the disciples could not understand Him. They did not understand Him until they discovered that He was the Son. Then the Fatherhood fell into its place and obtained its meaning.

The revelation of God's Fatherhood was made by Jesus. How was it made? Not by applying to God that name which on earth carries with it the idea of care and love. That would have been no revelation. Even the Hebrew psalmists were capable of that. 'Like as a father pitieth his children,' sang one of them, 'so Yahweh pitieth them that fear him.' He revealed the Father by revealing Himself as the Son. If there is a Son, there must be a Father. And—this was the mighty inference they drew—if He is the Father of Christ, He is our Father also. So when He told them how to pray, saying, 'When ye pray, say Father,' they said it, and it was a new word to them ; they said it because He said it before them.

And yet the disciples knew very well that they did not say 'Father' in exactly the same sense as Jesus did. They had come to recognize God as Father through Jesus Christ. Because He Himself was Son, they became sons. The relationship was original in Him, it was secondary in them. For Him it had no beginning ; they were begotten again unto this living hope by His resurrection from the dead. And so wherever the records

bring Christ and His disciples into relationship to the Father, they never forget that there is a distinction. They do not represent Christ as saying 'Our Father,' but always 'my Father and your Father.'

In what did that special relationship between Father and Son consist? It consisted in the purity and intensity of their affection. How shall we express it? One of the disciples expresses it by saying, 'God is love.' Not Jesus Himself; it is John that rises to that intensity. 'God is love'—therefore from the beginning the Father loved the Son, and the Son the Father. That is the bush that burns and is not consumed. Christ Himself called it glory. 'And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was . . . for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.'

This means that there are persons in God. We are sometimes afraid to speak of persons in the Godhead. We are afraid to say that the Father loves the Son, and the Son the Father. Or we say that the one can stand over against the other thus, loving and being loved, only after the Son has come into the world. Let us not be afraid. 'Father,' He says, 'thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.'

But let us not think that because there are two persons in the Godhead there must be two Gods. 'Hear, O Israel, Yahweh, thy God, Yahweh is one'—one from the very beginning, one to the very end. What makes two persons one? Unity of will. There is nothing else that can do it. And when the unity of will is perfect, is absolute; when it admits no conceivable degree of difference or moment of indecision, then those two persons are one. What did Jesus mean when He said, 'I and the Father are one'? He did not mean that they are not two persons, He meant that they are one God. And it is only so that any intelligible meaning can be found in the words, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.'

This home, finally, is a hive of industry. As the Father hath life in Himself, even so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself. And so, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' What is the work that they do? They are at work on this Universe. They are at work on man. We have no other revelation than that. But that revelation we have. They are busy with thoughts and deeds of Creation, Redemption, and Sanctification.

They are already at work on Creation. That, however, is the subject of the next chapter of this biography. They are also busy with the things of Redemption. 'Ye were redeemed,' says St. Peter, 'not with corruptible things, with silver or gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ: who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but was manifested at the end of the times.' And they are concerned to accomplish in men that Holiness without which no man shall see the Lord. As St. Paul expresses it in one of his benedictions, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ: even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love.'

Now these simple things—so simple and yet so profound—which are revealed of the life of Christ before He came into the world, are most momentous. They are the answer to all the problems of philosophy; they are the foundation and verification of all the doctrines of Christian theology.

They are the answer to the problems of philosophy. For all the problems of philosophy are due to the fact which St. Augustine's memorable words declare, 'Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts shall have no rest apart from Thee.' The heart finds rest when it comes home to that home of love where Christ dwelt with the Father before the foundation of the world.

And all theology is built upon them. First, there is this fundamental fact of love. Love is the source of the Universe and its upholding, for God is love. Next, it is the love of persons. The Father loves the Son and the Son the Father. Yet these persons are one God—in perfect unity of will. ‘I and the Father are one.’ And then, finally, this home, which is a home of rest because of the love and the unity, is also a home of activity. God is love, not only that the Father may love the Son and the Son the Father, but also that God may create man and love him.

And when God creates man and loves him, He creates man free to choose, and loves Him in spite of the evil choice he makes. This is the occupation of Christ with the Father even before the creation of the world, to love man in his sin and by persistent love to win him to holiness. For it is no more unthinkable that God should love sinners before the creation than that Christ should love us who are alive to-day when He gave Himself for us on the Tree.

Its truth is vindicated by the response the sinner makes.

O eyes that strip the souls of men !
There came to me the Magdalen.
Her blue robe with a cord was bound,
Her hair with Lenten lilies crowned.

‘Arise,’ she said, ‘God calls for thee,
Turned to new paths thy feet must be.
Leave the fever and the feast,
Leave the friend thou lovest best :
For thou must walk in barefoot ways,
To give my dear Lord Jesus praise.’

Then answered I—‘Sweet Magdalen,
God’s servant, once beloved of men,
Why didst thou change old ways for new,
That trailing red for corded blue,
Roses for lilies on thy brow,
Rich splendour for a barren vow?’

Gentle of speech she answered me :—
‘Sir, I was sick with revelry.
True, I have scarred the night with sin,
A pale and tawdry heroine ;
But once I heard a voice that said,
“Who lives in sin is surely dead,
But whoso turns to follow me
Hath joy and immortality.”’

‘O Mary, not for this,’ I cried,
‘Didst thou renounce thy scented pride.
Not for a taste of endless years
Or barren joy apart from tears
Didst thou desert the courts of men.
Tell me thy truth, sweet Magdalen !’

She trembled, and her eyes grew dim :—
‘For love of Him, for love of Him.’

Psychical Research and its Bearing on some Biblical Problems.

BY THE REV. C. W. EMMET, M.A., WEST HENDRED.

I BELIEVE that the Society of Psychical Research is still by some known as the ‘Spook Society.’ The nickname implies that its main business is the seeking out or even the brewing of ‘ghost stories,’ which, however indigestible they may be to the common sense, are eagerly swallowed by its members and form in fact their main mental and

spiritual nutriment. This view is somewhat inadequate ; it mistakes both the purpose and the temper of the S.P.R. Its purpose is to investigate phenomena which do not fall within the purview of Science as ordinarily organized—‘the unclassified residuum.’ These phenomena include telepathy, clairvoyance, second sight, crystal gazing,

premonitions and dreams; hypnotism, multiple personality, automatic speech and writing, trances and possession; hallucinations, knockings, apparitions of dead or of living persons, as well as 'the physical phenomena of spiritualism' as produced in séances. We may add to this varied menu a few hors-d'œuvres such as water-finding and other unclassified marvels, e.g. the hailstones of Remiremont.

Now, under all these heads, we have facts to study. People do see things, have premonitions which turn out true, write and speak in trances; extraordinary events do occur in the presence of certain mediums. Science ignores these things; they do not fit in with its scheme of the world. Religion too ignores them, paradoxically enough, seeing that the records of every religious system (including Christianity) are from first to last full of them. The S.P.R. simply exists to study the facts and claim them for Science (organized knowledge); it is not in the least tied to any one explanation of them. They may be due to conscious or unconscious fraud, to hysteria, to coincidence, to unrecognized workings of the mind itself, to the impact of one mind on another, to outside agencies or spirits, and probably most of these explanations hold good in one case or another. The problem is to classify the phenomena, to sift and test the hypotheses, but we may be perfectly clear that the S.P.R. does not encourage credulity. It would be enough to give a list of Presidents including Henry Sidgwick, A. J. Balfour, William James, Crookes, Myers, Oliver Lodge, Mrs. Henry Sidgwick, Andrew Lang, and, for the current year, Bergson. It has, in fact, been instrumental in many exposures—the Mahatmas and Mme. Blavatsky, the slate writer Eglinton, and mediums by the score. One of its members has written a scathing exposure of the professional medium in *The Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism*. Its canons of evidence are so stringent that prominent supporters have severed their connexion with the Society on account of its hopeless scepticism. The C.O.S. is not a greater terror to the writer of begging letters than is the S.P.R. to the paid medium.

The organized scientific study of psychical phenomena is of course in its infancy: the S.P.R. was founded only thirty years ago, and no finality can yet be looked for, but it may be useful to sketch the present position. Hypnotism has, of

course, now been adopted by up-to-date medical science, though it is still full of lessons and suggestions for the psychical researcher. Automatic writing, whether by hand or planchette, trance utterances and kindred phenomena are recognized as genuine, i.e. they are not due to trickery, nor are they a phase of insanity. The messages given are sometimes on a high level, and are drawn from a region which the subject or medium cannot tap in his waking hours. Whether the explanation is to be found in the powers of the subconscious self alone, in its possession or invasion by another personality, or in telepathy, is still undecided. The last-named holds just now a prominent place. It has been rendered almost certain that one mind can, under rare and unknown conditions, influence another and convey ideas to it without the use of the recognized material means; this phenomenon being regarded as a *vera causa* is being put forward as an explanation of the most varied abnormal occurrences (e.g. it is invoked to explain the famous cross-correspondences in the script of Mrs. Verrall and others). Whether it is not being stretched too far is another story. As has been pointed out in a recent presidential speech, the S.P.R. has itself convinced the world of telepathy, and is now accused of credulity or blindness if it does not use it as the all-sufficient explanation of every phenomenon. Again, it has been made very probable that visions seen in crystals are often strangely significant, that clairvoyants do at times discover weird secrets and that premonitions or intuitions (e.g. of danger) and warning voices sometimes speak the truth, that veridical apparitions occur and that phantasms show a strongly marked tendency to coincide with the death or critical position of the person seen, when that is quite unknown to the percipient. Nothing may yet have been proved under these heads, but there is clearly a case for further stringent inquiry. We can be satisfied with neither the shrug of Science, nor the easy-going rationalism of common sense, nor the pious horror of a certain type of religion.

'Spiritualism,' in the narrower sense, is rightly under a cloud: most of its phenomena have been proved to be due to fraud, so much so, in fact, that the presumption is that the rest are to be ascribed to the same source even where no trickery has so far been established. And yet the feeling remains strongest among many of those who have

come into closest touch with this branch of the subject that, in spite of the wretched contemptible story of imposture and credulity, there is in some cases an unexplained residuum, traces of mysterious forces at work unknown to and uncontrolled by the medium itself. Browning brings this out very significantly in 'Sludge the Medium.' In the midst of Sludge's abject confession of his cheating there is the undercurrent:

'I have told my lie,
And seen truth follow, marvels none of mine;
All was not cheating, sir, I'm positive !'
'This trade of mine—I don't know, can't be sure,
But there was something in it, tricks and all.'

If we assume for the moment that the medium has certain abnormal powers, they are not understood by himself and he cannot control them at will. He is expected to produce results at a particular time, and the results refuse to come when he most wants them: the temptation to substitute fraudulent phenomena is obvious. Possibly this explanation applies to the contradictory accounts of the various phenomena claimed as taking place in the presence of Eusapia Paladino. It is at any rate clear that whilst the discovery of what trickery can do in skilful hands should make us cautious to a degree, it does not finally shut the door to the possibility of there *being something else*.

It must be admitted that very little success has so far been attained in the purpose of the first founders of the S.P.R.—the collection of definite evidence for a future life. The tests devised by Myers, Hodgson, and others have failed, and no very definite conclusions can be drawn from the cross-correspondences; yet if direct proofs have not been found, a piece of indirect evidence of considerable value has emerged from the investigations. They have emphasized the mystery of human personality, its complexity, its possession of powers hardly recognized. If telepathy be a fact, if soul can communicate directly with soul without material means, there is at least a probability that it will survive the dissolution of its material home. In the workings of genius, trance, and clairvoyance we get glimpses of larger powers which seem to be in immediate touch with the unseen world. These powers are apparently abnormal here and alien to our present existence, but they may well be normal and find their full development in another state. They are not faculties which can be explained as evolved by the

struggle for existence, if we confine existence to our earthly life, yet they are not by-products or freaks of Nature: they are sometimes higher and nobler than many of our mundane faculties. May they not be indications, rare, but valuable, that we are greater than we know? May they not be indications that even now we have that within us which will fit us for life in a larger state, in a more spiritual atmosphere?

To put the same thing in another form, psychical research brings out the emotional, mystic side of life as opposed to the narrow, hard, materialistic view. It provides the bridge by which the man of Science may, and often does, pass to religion: we need only quote Myers and Oliver Lodge. This brings us to one of the main objects of this paper, which is to suggest a few of the ways in which psychical research may affect our view of the Bible and its narratives.

Miracles:—has it made them more credible? It has at least created an atmosphere in which they can be approached fairly and without *a priori* prejudice. If similar miracles do in fact happen now and have happened in all ages, it is obviously easier to accept those of the Bible. In certain cases they receive a direct confirmation; cures of mental diseases, accounts of possession and divination, the various gifts of the Spirit of which St. Paul writes, are all closely parallel to modern phenomena. If premonitions occur sporadically in the present day we have less reason to stumble over the account of Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch, or the supernatural guidance of St. Paul's life, or Ezekiel's telepathic knowledge of the fall of Jerusalem. In the same way, the 'demon' of Socrates, the stigmata of St. Francis, the voices of Joan of Arc and of the Mystics, have all been shown to be possible, for similar things happen now. 'The mental and physical are so interwoven; the possibilities of clairvoyance are so unexplored, that I do not feel constrained to abandon the traditional idea that the coming or going of a great personality may be heralded and accompanied by strange occurrences in the region of physical force.'¹

But we are bound to add that there is another side. A cursory acquaintance with the S.P.R. reports brings out the extraordinary fallibility of human evidence. Even trained observers, gathered for the express purpose of noting and narrating

¹ Oliver Lodge, *Man and the Universe*, p. 289, with reference to gospel miracles.

what they see, can give the most diverse and incomplete, and therefore inaccurate, reports of the same events. Much more do we find that the ordinary story of the marvellous is reduced to very commonplace proportions under cross-examination and criticism. The student of the S.P.R. literature will underline the caution that the accounts in the Bible are not written as accurate scientific records and would receive a very different form to-day. From a purely documentary point of view they are insufficient as evidence, though there may be other grounds on which this conclusion should be modified. Again, we must cease, even more decidedly than we do, to regard the Bible miracles as miraculous in the popular sense. They are in many cases not unique, nor are they in themselves evidence of a direct Divine interposition, as opposed to that general Providence which we believe is always at work in the world. We begin to see dimly that they happen in obedience to laws, however imperfectly we may be able to understand or formulate them. Wonderful voices or healings can no longer be regarded as necessarily due to any immediate outpouring of a special Divine power, and, as the Bible itself insists, the miracle *per se* is no guarantee of truth or holiness. Because a man possesses to an unusual degree the power of controlling nature by mind and can produce abnormal phenomena, he is not necessarily a good man, nor is his message to be accepted as inspired. The miracle must be judged by its intrinsic character; the teaching supports the miracle, not the miracle the teaching. This is well-worn ground, but psychical research emphasizes the truth of the contention. Some mediums are morally good, and their communications are valuable: with others it is the reverse. The power of producing extraordinary psychical phenomena seems to have little connexion with character. Hence, while this line of inquiry vindicates in part the general accuracy of the Biblical narratives, it does nothing to restore miracles to their traditional position in Christian apologetics. The facts are in certain cases confirmed, but they cease to be miracles in the old sense.

A word with regard to the Resurrection:—‘The appearances during the forty days are mysterious, but they can be accepted very much as they stand; for they agree with our experience of genuine psychical phenomena the world over, and a farewell phantasmal [appearance, described as an Ascen-

sion, is credible enough.’¹ What this means is that the appearances will no longer be ascribed to fraud or myth or the growth of legend. The gospel accounts are recognized as substantially accurate records of genuine psychical experiences on the part of the apostles. Whether they are subjective or objective those who approach the question from this point of view will hardly yet agree. We ourselves have other lines of proof and must protest against any idea that our belief in the present life of Christ is to depend in the least upon whether or not we can accept the narratives of present-day phantasms, nor can we entirely accept Myers’ oft-quoted dictum, ‘I predict that in consequence of the new evidence all reasonable men a century hence will believe the Resurrection of Christ, whereas in default of the new evidence no reasonable man a century hence would have believed it.’ But it is possible that further investigation into the conditions of such events may affect our interpretation of the mode of the manifestations of the Risen Christ. We may come to understand more of the spiritual body and of the psychical experiences through which the apostles passed; and we may remind ourselves that this line of proof, though perhaps superfluous to the instructed Christian, yet seems to offer just what the temper of the present age requires. If it helps men to Christ we should not lightly throw scorn upon it.²

We pass to the phénoména of trance, ecstasy, and prophecy, ‘the psychology of inspiration.’ This is a subject on which we may certainly expect fresh light in the future. We see clearly that the language about trances or messages from the unseen which we find in the Bible is not a mere literary convention, but at any rate represents real psychical experiences.³ How are we to interpret them? The theory of the subliminal self may be of great value. It suggests that there is a part of our personality which is in close touch with the unseen world and which can, in the religious or artistic genius, utilize its subconscious experiences

¹ Oliver Lodge, *op. cit.* p. 291.

² The subject is too large for adequate treatment within the limits of this paper; in order to avoid misapprehensions, I would venture to refer to a fuller discussion in my *Eschatological Question in the Gospels, and other Studies in New Testament Criticism*, pp. 128 ff. The view taken above underlies Mr. Streeter’s remarkable study of the Resurrection in *Foundations*, and it is sympathetically discussed by Dr. Robinson in his *Studies in the Resurrection of Christ*, chap. viii.

³ Ezekiel is perhaps the best example of this.

in a form which can be understood by the normal mundane self. It draws upon a storehouse which the ordinary mind (perhaps the ordinary man) cannot tap; and when it can articulate its discoveries (the power of adequate expression is often wanting) we get works of genius, inspiration, or revelation. Modern examples are fully in line with the claim which is characteristic of the psychology of the prophet—that his message is not his own; that it comes from a source outside him, and that to some extent it passes his full understanding. Yet it comes through his brain and bears the stamp of his own individuality. But here again we need to be reminded that the ultimate criterion is the inherent truth of the message, not the fact that it claims to have come in trance or ecstasy, by dream or intuition, or through any other abnormal channel. The reader will remember that Dr. Sanday¹ has used the theory of the subliminal self to explain the deepest of all problems—the Personality of Christ—and in spite of the somewhat cold reception which this bold hypothesis has received, it is probable that we have by no means heard the last of it.

It remains to say something as to the legitimacy of this line of inquiry. It does at times rouse a certain repugnance which comes from various sources. Much of this antipathy is at bottom prejudice and should be treated as nothing more. It is very often as purely a physical and intuitive dislike of the uncanny as is the woman's objection to a mouse, and deserves no more respect. Nor are the intellectual objections very serious. A fact is a fact, be the explanation what it may. The facts of psychical research are at their lowest of enormous psychological interest and are unquestionably worth studying in a scientific temper. To do so no more implies superstition than the study of anthropology implies a leaning towards animism. More serious is the moral objection which dislikes the apparent violation of personality involved in many forms of psychical research. We resent the idea that our inmost thoughts should be known to others except in so far as we deliberately choose to communicate them, or that any one should probe our mind or use it for experimental purposes. It will be seen at once that this objection applies mainly to those branches into which hypnotism enters. The ethics of hypnotism open up a wide field. Here it must suffice to say that probably no

one can be hypnotized against his will, that he cannot be made to do under hypnotism things against which his moral sense would revolt, and that experience shows that hypnotism properly used, so far from weakening or breaking up the personality, may be a powerful factor in restoring its balance and sanity.

We come finally to the directly religious objections which base themselves on what seems to be the teaching of the Bible and on the strong antipathy natural to the serious mind to any dealing with what is called the occult; it seems *prima facie* to be a relapse to a lower religious standpoint. A tempting solution is to distinguish between a mere study of phenomena on the one hand, and the attempt to produce them by experiment on the other. A minute's reflexion will show us that the distinction cannot be maintained. If the psychical researcher is told of noises in a haunted house he will obviously wish to put himself in the way of hearing them for himself. If he is told of strange phenomena occurring in the presence of a medium he must witness them under test conditions. Research can do very little without experiment.

Let us then look more closely at the real mind of the Bible on this subject. We are all familiar with its condemnation of sorcery, witchcraft, necromancy, and so on; it is needless to quote texts. Yet we find much of the same nature which is recognized as perfectly legitimate. Pharaoh has his magicians, yet Moses and Aaron do the same things as they do: Daniel is head of the magicians of Babylon. Dependence on dreams is forbidden, yet Joseph, Daniel, and Joseph in the New Testament interpret them by the help of God. Divination in various forms is also forbidden, yet we find that Jahweh worship has its Urim and Thummim and its oracles connected with the Ark. A Gideon is guided by an omen or sign; a prophet is expected to disclose the whereabouts of lost asses for a fee; an apostle is chosen by lot. Side by side with the condemnation of heathen oracles, frenzy and possession, we have the trances and spiritual visions of the prophets or St. Paul, and the psychical phenomena connected with the gifts of the Spirit. On the side of phantasms of the dead we can quote the story of the Witch of Endor (the shade of Samuel brings a message from Jahweh), the appearances of Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration, and of the many bodies of the Saints after the Resurrection. We

¹ *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, chaps. vi.-viii.

need not necessarily accept all these things as facts, and we must allow for the growth of revelation. Many of the examples belong to its primitive stages, but it remains true that what are called psychical phenomena are closely connected with, and used by, the true Religion. Certain modes may drop out, but in the gifts of the Spirit and the life of St. Paul we find others vouched for in the age which is recognized as the high-water mark of Christian experience. The warnings against sorcery and so on cannot then be interpreted as shutting the door against any interest in, or attempt to produce, abnormal phenomena. How are we to distinguish between the legitimate and the illegitimate? Looking at the phenomena from outside it would seem impossible to do so. What is the line between Urim and Thummim or the lot by which Matthias was chosen and heathen divination? Regarded purely as a psychical experience, how does St. Paul's trance differ from that of the god-possessed *μάρτις*? It is obvious that the distinction is not to be sought in the things themselves, but in the point of view from which they are approached and the results to which they lead. The fact is that the forms of magic condemned in the Old Testament or by St. Paul are not forbidden as being mysterious and abnormal, but as immediately connected with heathenism. To have recourse to them implied a definite abandonment of Jahweh and the national worship in order to obtain the help of alien deities. Further, there was usually the element of secrecy; the attempt was made to gain the knowledge and control of hidden powers in order to injure others thereby. Hence, the criterion is the temper of mind in which such things are handled. The man who thinks he is going to discover occult powers which he may use to his own advantage, or a short cut to knowledge, or a new religion, had better have nothing to do with psychical research. On the other hand, there can be nothing wrong in studying the subject with the sincere desire to know, and the unbiased love of truth—essentially a religious instinct. All that is must happen in obedience to God's laws, and if we can discover them we may be confident that we are meant to do so. To say, as some do, that these phenomena are facts but are the work of evil spirits or devils sent to delude us, is to reproduce precisely the argument of those who explained the geological relics on the tops of mountains or the cave traces

of prehistoric man, as tricks of Satan whereby he led to perdition the sceptics who disbelieved in the first chapters of Genesis.

A parallel with sexual powers is instructive. On account of their mystery and their ready liability to abuse, these have, as we know, been sometimes regarded as bad *per se*. The mediæval monk saw in them the direct temptation of evil spirits, but we recognize that this attitude is really treason to the Creator. Man has powers which may easily become the occasion of sin, but they cannot be in themselves 'common and unclean.' What can be known ought to be known, and if we have mysterious powers they can only come from God and we ought to develop and use them if possible. Of course they must be under control and used for proper ends, as must every gift of God; *abusus non tollit usum*. Hypnotism, trances, and thought-reading have their dangers as have chloroform or explosives, and they should, when necessary, be under medical control: mental vivisection must be regulated as much as animal vivisection, but it need not be prohibited,¹ and experience has amply proved that psychical research has no dangers for the well-balanced mind. It may sometimes upset one of a hysterical temperament precisely as violent exercise is bad for a weak heart, or night-nursing plays havoc with weak nerves. A thing which is not good for everybody is not therefore bad in itself.

The upshot of the matter is surely this. If there is room for abnormal phenomena in the laws of Nature (which are the laws of God) they must be accepted as making ultimately for the good of the race as much as any other event which may happen to be distasteful to us individually. A Christian may encourage psychical research, seriously conducted under proper safeguards, with a clear conscience and with no faithless forebodings of what it may reveal. If it ultimately explains its phenomena in accordance with the laws of Science as at present understood, we shall have gained some valuable insight into the psychology of hallucination, and Science can go about its work untroubled. If we do get glimpses of new laws and new faculties, to one who believes that nature and man are both alike of God's ordering, these laws can have no terrors and these faculties can only hold out the promise of a profounder knowledge of Him and of His truth.

¹ It will, of course, be remembered that no one should be the subject of experiment without his full consent.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ACTS.

THE FACE AND THE VISION.

And all that sat in the council, fastening their eyes on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel.—Acts vi. 15.

But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.—Acts vii. 55, 56.

1. A PECULIAR interest gathers about the name of Stephen. He was the proto-martyr of the Christian Church, and possessed the nobler qualities of the martyr without any of the fanaticism or vainglory which some of his successors have exemplified. Thus he furnishes a type of what the true martyr should be, and stands first and foremost in the royal line of those who have sealed their testimony with their blood.

To be the first martyr in the cause of Christ was indeed a high calling; to follow his Lord and Saviour before the Apostles was a wonderful honour. This is St. Stephen's glory. He had but lately been chosen into the lowest order of the sacred ministry; he was but a young man compared with many of longer standing in the Church; but he outstripped the rest and reached the goal first. It is ever so that the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and we only hear the sound thereof.

2. Stephen's association with Paul is another circumstance which rivets attention, and suggests many reflexions. It is evident that Stephen's bearing and great address before the Sanhedrin made a deep impression upon the heart of Saul of Tarsus. It helped to produce the revulsion of feeling which issued in his conversion on the way to Damascus; and, when in after years he bore witness to his Lord, it was the speech of Stephen that was the model which he followed as he vindicated the cause of Christ in the face of his accusers.

I.

THE ANGEL FACE.

'Saw his face as it had been the face of an angel.'

There has been a good deal of discussion in regard to the meaning of what Luke here says. Most commentators regard the radiance of

Stephen's face as purely natural, the manifestation of the spirit of faith and zeal which kindled his soul into unwonted ardour. But some, such as Alford, Knowling, and others, are disposed to view it as a supernatural illumination like that which glorified the face of Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration.

We may be sure that this comparison is not introduced by way of ornament. St. Luke does not mean merely to tell us that St. Stephen's face was beautiful and radiant with conscious innocence, truth of purpose, and entire trust in God. All this, no doubt, but more. We may believe that strength, not of earth, but of Heaven, sat upon the young deacon's countenance—strength, like that of St. Michael, to contend before rulers and kings for the Lord's sake, which 'all that sat in the council, looking stedfastly upon him, saw,' although they failed to perceive that Immortal Source from whence it came.¹

He heeded not reviling tones
Nor sold his heart to idle moans,
Tho' scorned and mocked and bruised with stones.

But, looking upward, full of grace,
He prayed, and from a happy place,
God's glory smote him on the face.²

1. What are some of the characteristics of an angel face? None of us has ever seen an angel's face, and yet the writer of this chapter without a word of explanation, and with marvellous excess of boldness, says that all those who saw St. Stephen's face saw it as it had been the face of an angel. He takes it for granted that this bold comparison will be clearly understood by those for whom he writes, and we read the description without feeling that the comparison is at all incongruous. Yet, what is our idea of an angel's face? Suppose in an audience of people—Christian people—each one were furnished with paper and pencil and were asked to write down, without consulting one another, what each thought an angel's face was like. What a variety of notions there would doubtless be! The exercise would not be without value, for it would show what definite ideas we have about those heavenly beings with whom we one day hope to associate.

Among the characteristics suggested by the comparison the following may be mentioned.

(1) *Calmness and strength.* There was much in

¹ H. A. Coit.

² Tennyson.

Stephen's situation that might well have produced anxiety and appalled his spirit. But none of these things moved him. A furious crowd surging round him, hatred gleaming from every face, curses leaping from many throats and with hands clenched over the stones they were ready to hurl at him. But there in the face of his enemies, some of them doubtless his former friends, men of his own nationality, of his own town, with death staring him in the face, he stood calm and steadfast, his face like that of an angel.

When Lord Byron sat for his bust, which Thorwaldsen was modelling for him, he moved so uneasily in his chair and changed the expression of his features to such a degree that the artist was at length obliged to request him to keep his face still. On Byron's making answer that such was the usual expression of his countenance, Thorwaldsen merely replied, 'Indeed!' and went on with his work, producing an excellent likeness in which restlessness is visibly portrayed. But Byron was not alone in wearing a habitual look of restlessness. Stand for a few minutes at the corner of one of the crowded streets of any town, or at a railway station, and you will see what an absence there is of calm in the countenances of the throng. If there is anything that is characteristically a feature of a man's life it is this want of calm, although all desire to possess it.¹

(2) *Youthfulness and beauty.* Angels are 'ever bright and fair.' They are invested with immortal youth. In the Old Testament stories the angels that minister to men are always represented as young, and such is the case also with the monkish legends of the Middle Ages. Artists too have accepted this idea, and from the cartoons of Raphael to the paintings of Burne Jones 'have invariably painted angelic forms with the freshness and fascination of youth.' And George MacDonald, inheriting these traditions, makes Andrew Cumin say to his wife: 'But what I was lauchin' at was the thocht of anybody being auld up there. We'll a' be young there, lass.'

(3) *Christlikeness.* The angels who always behold the face of Christ reflect His loveliness and glory; and so did Stephen when he confronted his enemies in Christ's name. This is the glory that excelleth. There is no beauty like the beauty of Christ. And in their degree it has been the attainment of many of Christ's servants who have walked in daily fellowship with Him.

The time when I would have liked my father's look to have been perpetuated, was that of all others the least likely, or indeed possible;—it was when, after administering the

Sacrament to his people, and having solemnized every one, and been himself profoundly moved by that Divine, everlasting memorial, he left the elders' seat and returned to the pulpit, and after giving out the psalm, sat down wearied and satisfied, filled with devout gratitude to his Master—his face pale, and his dark eyes looking out upon us all, his whole countenance radiant and subdued. Any likeness of him in this state, more like that of the proto-martyr, when his face was as that of an angel, than anything I ever beheld, would have made one feel what it is so impossible otherwise to convey,—the mingled sweetness, dignity, and beauty of his face. When it was winter, and the church darkening, and the lights at the pulpit were lighted so as to fall upon his face and throw the rest of the vast assemblage into deeper shadow, the effect of his countenance was something never to forget.²

2. Let us consider the impression which the angel face made upon those who saw it. 'And all that sat in the council, fastening their eyes on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel.' The strength, the calm, and beauty of Stephen's face struck even unsympathetic beholders. It was so lighted up with a Divine effulgence that none was insensible to it. But though it was unwillingly recognized by all, the influence of it was resisted.

The appearance did not out-dazzle or overawe them. It merely attracted, and, for the moment, arrested them. It did not turn them from their purpose, their passion was too fierce, but it brought them to a pause, imprinted itself upon them, and—may we not suppose?—came back in waking thoughts and nightly dreams, and never deserted some of them till they saw it again before the throne of God.

II.

THE HEAVENLY VISION.

Probably the Sanhedrin met in the usual chamber, not in the open air; and, if so, the character of the vision is necessarily subjective and inward. There was but a roof over the martyr's head, and other eyes looking up saw only rafters and cobwebs; but to him the illimitable heavens opened in their depths. The condition of beholding is emphatically given as 'being full of the Holy Ghost,' which seems distinctly to imply that the organ of perception was 'that inward eye' which sees the things that are, where others see only the waves breaking on the rocks of Patmos. That conception of the nature of the vision does not in the least affect its reality or its Divine source. It only affects the manner of the manifestation. No

² John Brown, *Horae Subsecivae*, i. 59 (Letter to Dr. John Cairns).

one else saw what Stephen saw, as is plain from the burst of horror which met his declaration. But he did see. It was no phantasm or airy fancy, the child of overstrained nervous tension and longing. If we judged by heaven's canons, we should recognize that the vision was far more 'real' than the roof.¹

1. It was a real vision of the unseen and eternal which was vouchsafed to Stephen. A vision is not granted to a dying witness of God of something that is not true. If he has a privilege above others, it is the privilege of discerning that which is true more vividly, more intensely than he had discerned it before, or than other men discern it. That such a choice gift was bestowed upon St. Stephen I truly believe; and therefore I believe that the Collect for his day is right in asking that these same gifts be bestowed upon all who, in any age, are suffering for the truth.²

Saint, did I say? with your remembered faces,
Dear men and women, whom I sought and slew!
Ah, when we mingle in the heavenly places,
How will I weep to Stephen and to you!

Oh for the strain that rang to our reviling
Still, when the bruised limbs sank upon the sod,
Oh for the eyes that looked their last in smiling,
Last on this world here, but their first on God!³

2. The vision was twofold in which Stephen saw the glory of God, and also the Son of God at God's right hand.

(1) He saw the glory of God, the unapproachable light in which God is clothed, and which in ancient times was manifested in the shechinah. Whenever the heavens are opened, the glory of God is seen. That is what fills all the heavenly region. We are told in the final picturing of it, in the Book of Revelation, that 'it has the glory of God,' and that 'the glory of God doth lighten it.' But what Stephen saw was more than the general pervading of Heaven by the brightness of the Divine glory. It was the concentration of all glory at the throne. It was the very centre sun, the very fountain head of glory, the Person of the Living One, the God of Glory. This is not to say that he beheld, before his actual entrance into heaven, the face or form of the Eternal Father. Can we say that there is ever such a visible sight

¹ A. Maclaren, *The Acts*, 74.

² F. D. Maurice, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 93.

³ F. W. H. Myers, *Saint Paul*.

of Him? At any rate, that is a sight beyond mortal power of endurance, forbidden to fleshly eyes. 'He dwelleth in the light which is inaccess-
ible.' No man can see God and live. But Stephen saw what Moses and the elders of Israel saw, when they climbed Mount Horeb at God's invitation, and 'saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness.'

(2) He saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God. It was an early suggestion of Chrysostom's that Jesus was standing to help His faithful servant, and this supposition is generally endorsed; but it is usual to combine with it the thought that Jesus was awaiting His servant to welcome him to his reward. The ascended Christ both succours and welcomes those who die in His name.

What men need is the spiritual vision, the illuminated eye. He, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up and saw. There is a vision which comes only with spiritual fulness. In the world of nature the sight is the door to the spirit, but in the world of grace the spirit is the door to the sight. In my natural life God enters from without and penetrates within; in my spiritual life God enters from within and makes His progress outward. The first thing in the life of nature is the last thing in the life of spirit-vision. I am often asking why it is that so little is revealed to me; it is because I myself am so little. If I had more spirituality I would have more sight. There are treasures lying at the door of my dwelling which seem to me simply like a dust-heap. Some day I shall awake and marvel at my own riches; I shall marvel at the wells of water which were lying in my desert; I shall marvel at the crowns that were cast at the foot of my cross; I shall marvel at the beauty which lay at the top of the Dolorous way. The revelation is already waiting for me; it is blazoned on the sky, it is imprinted on the air, it will be inscribed upon my heart when I have ceased to be a child. When I am full of the Holy Ghost I shall look up and see.⁴

3. The closing words of Stephen were full of energy and fire. Most remarkably he repeated the identical words which Jesus had used when, standing before the same council, He foretold His glorification. The effect was instantaneous. It reminded Stephen's opponents of what Jesus had said; it reminded them that He had escaped out of their hands; it assured them that He whom they had crucified was exalted at God's right hand, and maddened by these thoughts 'they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord.' It was by faith that Stephen endured as seeing Him who is invisible.

⁴ G. Matheson, *Voices of the Spirit*, 125.

Give me a man who can look with an eye of faith beyond the narrow limits that birth, or accident, or circumstance, or his means has assigned to him—

That sees beyond the circle of his years,
Beyond the border of this narrow world ;—

a man, too, who lets God possess him ; who not only sets God at his right hand, but allows God really to use his right hand ; who each day tries to realize that he is but an instrument for God to use to help the world ; who each day realizes he is not his own, but is bought with a price ; and who each day says at the call of duty, 'Here am I, send me' ; if it be but to pick a child from the gutter, or help a lame dog over a stile—a man who in doubt or difficulty says (yea, even in the doubt and difficulty of hard breathing before his death), 'Father, not my will, but thine be done' ;—a man, in a word, filled with the Holy Ghost,—and there is no telling what capacity will be developed ; for whatever use God wants the man, that man's usefulness will appear at the call.

Before the rush of the day begins, let us take time to gaze or a space into the face of the King ; for one whose eyes

are open to the invisible, who sees with clear spiritual sight the angels and the angels' Lord beside him, can go on his way with high courage and perfect peace, sure that all is well.

A poor shoemaker once dreamed that the Lord Jesus would visit him on a certain day. He lived in a dark basement room, below the level of the street, and could only see the feet of those who passed by. Several times during the day he saw shabby boots moving wearily past his window, and hurried out to invite the tired wayfarers in for rest and food. All day he watched and waited for the promised Guest, and went sadly to bed at last, thinking that his dream had not come true.

But he dreamed again, and the tired strangers he had cheered and helped stood beside his bed, saying, 'Martin, dost thou not know Me?' Then he saw in each face a look of the King, and knew that his loved Master had really visited that poor little home many times during the day.

This is not a parable ; it is a glorious fact, Christ, in the person of some of His brethren, will surely visit us this day. Are our eyes opened so that we may recognize Him?¹

¹ Dora Farncomb, *The Vision of His Face*, 2.

The Subliminal Consciousness as an Aid to the Interpretation of Religious Experience.

BY THE REV. JOHN BAILLIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

THE most desultory reader of the theological literature of the last few years cannot but have remarked the constant tendency among writers in other respects very different from one another to fall back upon the idea of a Subliminal or Subconscious self as the key to the solution of all sorts of difficulties. Almost every day one finds some new writer casting sanguine glances in that direction, if haply some problem long dark to him should find its solutions also in that half-lit region. Doctrinal entities so diverse as Immortality, the traditional Christology, the nature of the Deity, and the religious experience of the individual, have all been regarded as finding their true explanation in the Subliminal. What we propose to do here is to choose out one of these problems, the most central one, and ask whether the introduction of this new quantity really gives us any help towards its solution. Is the conception of the Subliminal self going to be of any help to us in the interpretation of the individual's religious experience? It is with this psychological question that we shall concern ourselves here.

Let us begin by examining the proposals of the two most representative writers who take a positive

attitude towards this subject,—the late Professor James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*, and Dr. Sanday in his recent *Christologies Ancient and Modern*. They are not the only writers who have positive views on the matter, but they have perhaps developed their views with the greatest detail, and probably we shall not lose anything that is valuable by confining our attention to them.

I.

Let us begin with Dr. Sanday ; leaving out of account, of course, the Christological application of his view, and confining ourselves to the psychological side of it. The fact of religious experience which Dr. Sanday tries to explain by reference to the Subliminal is the indwelling of God in the soul, or the fact of union with God. 'The proper seat or *locus* of all divine indwelling, or divine action upon the human soul,' he says, 'is the subliminal consciousness.'¹ Or again, 'The deepest truth of mysticism, and of the states of which we have been speaking as mystical, belongs not so much to the upper region of consciousness—the region of symptoms, manifestations, effects—as to the lower

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 159.

regions of the unconscious.¹ He calls it here the *lower* region, but in common with most of its devotees he is inclined to make it first in importance. In general Dr. Sanday seems to urge that the sense of union with God which the religious man undoubtedly experiences cannot be explained in terms merely of the ordinary 'upper' consciousness, and that therefore we must believe the union itself to take place in a subjacent region, Myers' 'subliminal consciousness.'

And I do not think it is difficult to understand what prompts Dr. Sanday to take refuge in this alternative. He is anxious to show that the indwelling of God in man is a real objective fact, an actual contact of two separate personalities. He finds it difficult to show at what point in the ordinary psychic process this contact takes place, and therefore he welcomes with eagerness the suggestion that it does not take place there at all, but in a totally different region, the laws of which are as yet almost completely unknown. Moreover, there has always been a tendency to regard the workings of the Spirit of God as in some sense underground, unpsychological, or even half-unconscious.

The question we must now ask, therefore, is whether anything is really to be gained by referring the indwelling of God in man to a subliminal stratum of mental life? Personally, I cannot think that there is, and I shall give my reasons in detail.

(1) To begin with, it should be clear that the fact that we know little or nothing of the subliminal region is not a reason why we should readily refer certain facts to it, but a reason why we should steadily refrain from referring them to it. If we find that a certain supposed process cannot take place in the ordinary psychic life, the reasonable inference is not to say that it must take place in the Subliminal region, but rather that it does not take place at all. For if we have no evidence to the contrary, the natural thing to suppose is that the Subliminal Consciousness is, *mutatis mutandis*, precisely the same as the 'waking' consciousness. And if there are differences between the two regions, we have no reason to believe that they are such as to suit our preconceived theories. To defend a fact by referring it to the unknown is virtually to give it up; like some erratic physicist who, when he had discovered beyond doubt that some favourite fancy of his did not fit in with the

laws of the earth, proceeded to defend its actuality by saying it must be true of the moon, whose laws are less completely known. This may appear to be an unsympathetic criticism, but so far as the reference to the Subliminal is meant as a *defence*, it is undoubtedly just; and further we should not press it.

(2) There is, however, a more serious criticism to be passed. Not only does the reference of the fact of union with God to the Subliminal do no good, but it does positive harm; for there can be little doubt that according to any reasonable view to relegate a fact to the Subliminal stratum is to relegate it to the background, and to lessen its bearing on everyday life. Despite Myers' constant contention that the Subliminal is in no way abnormal or morbid, it remains undeniably true that its salient manifestations in human experience up to the present time have been almost wholly of a pathological nature. And it would be difficult to convince men of the naturalness and normality of the life with God, if that life were shown to be primarily subliminal. Indeed we can put the matter much more strongly than this; we can say that to make the union with God subconscious is, so far as we can guess, to make it infra-ethical. According to the most enthusiastic supporters of the subconscious, the act of *judgment* is not possible at this level, and a moral act which does not imply a judgment is something we cannot understand. Similarly it is a question whether any one would say that *purposive* life is possible on this level, and surely all value is meaningless apart from that.

(3) And there is still a third objection. The relegation of the fact of union with God to the Subliminal or Subconscious is not only harmful, but also—and we may say fortunately—quite uncalled for and unnecessary. It is, in fact, due to a misunderstanding of the nature of such union. Dr. Sanday's difficulty in seeing how God can enter into our life in the normal region of ordinary consciousness, seems to me to spring simply from the fact that he is looking for a sort of union that exists neither there nor anywhere else. He is looking for a *point* of contact, for a definite point in the psychological process when the Spirit of God breaks in or supervenes. And, of course, there is no such point to be found. But the inference is—and this is the important issue—not that it is now to be looked for in an unknown subjacent stratum, but

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 155.

rather that the whole notion of a point of contact is to be abandoned for the more philosophical one of a continuous, omnipresent indwelling. We must no longer ask, with Dr. Sanday, 'Where in the human soul is the proper seat or *locus* of the divine?' The *whole* soul is God's house, and if He dwells in any part of it rather than in another, it is not in its underground crypts and cellars, but in its loftiest and clearest chamber. It is never anything but confusion that makes us seek for God in the occult and the unfamiliar and the exceptional, instead of in the open spaces of our everyday ethical and spiritual life. And there is nothing in the nature of the sense of the presence of God, which should tempt us to locate its springs in a subliminal region. It may take a subtle psychology to analyze it completely, but it should be obvious that it is from beginning to end ethical; that it is with us most in our clearest moments; and that it takes its rise, not in dim, instinctive, semi-cerebral psychoses, but in the fullest light of human intelligence. And that is all that need be said about this matter.

II.

Let us now turn to what William James has to say. Like his friend, Dr. Starbuck, he calls in the aid of the Subliminal Consciousness at a different point in the interpretation of religious experience from any that we have yet considered, his crowning instance of its operation being that of *sudden conversion*. He begins by giving us 'illustrations of subconsciously maturing processes eventuating in results of which we suddenly grow conscious.'¹ His conclusion is that 'when the new centre of personal energy has been subconsciously incubated so long as to be just ready to open into flower, "hands off" is the only word for us, it must burst forth unaided!'² Or, in greater detail, 'The most important consequence of having a strongly developed ultra-marginal life of this sort is that one's ordinary fields of consciousness are liable to incursions from it of which the subject does not guess the source, and which, therefore, take for him the form of unaccountable impulses to act or inhibitions of action, of obsessive ideas, or even of hallucinations of sight or hearing.'³ And, finally, in his concluding chapter, he says, 'When in addition to these phenomena of inspiration, we take religious mysticism into the account, when we recall the striking and sudden unifications

of a discordant self which we saw in conversion, and when we review the extravagant obsessions of tenderness, purity, and self-severity met with in saintliness, we cannot, I think, avoid the conclusion that in religion we have a department of human nature with unusually close relations to the transmarginal or subliminal region.'⁴

The principle of these contentions is clear at once. The 'sudden incursions,' whether in the form of decisions, inhibitions, 'unifications,' or conversions, are explained as the entry into consciousness of the completed result of a 'subconscious' process. It is virtually the principle of the 'summation of stimuli,' and it has an undoubted plausibility. We must, however, leave the discussion of the validity of this principle in general to the final discussion of the whole conception of the Subconscious which is yet to come. At present I wish to suggest two difficulties of a more special nature which are raised by James' view.

(1) To any one who reads James' chapter on sudden conversions, the objection must suggest itself that he is not dealing with normal cases. An ordinary normal conversion does not present the features which his examples present; and even those *sudden* conversions with which most of us are familiar are explicable on an easier theory than that of a long unconscious subterranean process bursting suddenly into consciousness. It might be answered, perhaps, that granting this, it still remains true that the extreme, abnormal, 'limiting' cases are just the valuable ones for psychology. But in the present case it is a pure confusion to think that this is so. For in this region an extreme or unusual case is simply a case in which new, and indeed morbid, factors come into play; so that they belong to the pathology, not to the normal anatomy, of the religious consciousness. If what we are seeking is a description of the normal and healthy religious consciousness, it is manifestly unreasonable to go for our facts either to extreme or to unusual cases, where it is probable that disturbing conditions are present. This seems to me to be an almost inevitable objection to James' statement, that 'when we review the *extravagant obsessions*, etc., we cannot . . . avoid the conclusion that in religion we have a department of human nature with unusually close relations to the transmarginal or subliminal region.'⁵ For a man

¹ *Varieties*, p. 207.

² *Ibid.* p. 210.

³ *Ibid.* p. 234.

⁴ *Varieties*, pp. 483-484.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 483, italics mine.

who studies average religious experience, and does not concentrate his attention on its extravagances, there is nothing which would lead to the conclusion that the seat of religion is outside of the ordinary 'waking' consciousness.

(2) My other difficulty is analogous to one which we found in our last section. It is the difficulty of retaining the ethical nature of sudden decisions and sudden conversion, if we accept the account of them which James offers. We may illustrate it well from certain things which James himself says about the subliminal region. 'Much of the content of this larger background . . . is insignificant. Imperfect memories, silly jingles, inhibitive timidities . . . enter into it in large part.'¹ 'Our intuitions, hypotheses, fancies, superstitions, persuasions, convictions, *and in general all our non-rational operations* come from it. It is the source of our dreams, and apparently they may return to it.'² I think it will be admitted that if the momentous decisions of our lives come from a region such as this, we are more at the mercy of instinct and of unintelligent, unknown forces, than most of us had fondly imagined. We must grant, however, that this appeal is not a sufficient scientific rejoinder to James' contention; for that we must go to the more technical argument to which we now proceed.

III.

For we must now ask, What is the Subliminal? and what is the Subconscious? or do these things exist at all? It will be observed that so far the result of our discussion has been to show that, *even granting* the general reasonableness and utility of the concept of a transmarginal mental region, there is no reason for connecting it in any special way with the religious consciousness. But now let us ask whether the concept is itself a reasonable one, whether it is of any value for the interpretation of any region of experience. Only thus can we hope to settle the matter finally. The first thing to be done is to distinguish at last between the Subliminal on the one hand and the Subconscious on the other. So far, we have been content to use these terms as interchangeably as do the writers whom we have discussed. But there can be no doubt that they properly denote quite different things. They are the results of entirely different lines of thought, and are, according to

their best supporters, based upon almost entirely different facts.

(1) The Subliminal was the name given by Frederick Myers to a quantity which he himself introduced into psychology. It was offered by him as an explanation of the facts of hypnotism and 'double personality.' In what is perhaps his best statement on the matter,³ he begins by expressing his discontent with the current fashion of explaining them away as 'mere morbid disintegrations of the empirical personality,' and then proceeds to offer his own theory that there are in all of us *several strata of consciousness*, of which the ordinary 'waking' consciousness is only one; and that these phenomena of hypnotism, etc., simply represent the moments when we become 'aware of some other stratum.' 'I suggest then,' he proceeds, 'that the stream of consciousness in which we habitually live is not the only consciousness which exists in connection with our organism.'

(2) The idea of Subconsciousness is something quite different. It stands, and has always stood, not for the idea that there are in man several consciousnesses, but for the idea that consciousness is not coextensive with mental facts, that there are phenomena which, though mental, are still not conscious. The Subconscious is therefore defined as the non-conscious region of the mind, the series of non-conscious mental phenomena. The facts on which it is based are roughly these: the unconscious retention in memory of past experiences; the apparent forming of associations with objects of which we were not conscious at the time of their occurrence; the effect made upon the total state of mind by objects in (e.g.) the visual field, which we do not seem to be directly attending to—I am said, for instance, to be subconscious of the margin of a book when I am attending to the printed matter; and the fact that stimuli which are too faint to attract our attention singly, seem to be unconsciously or subconsciously summed up, and so to burst suddenly into consciousness.

IV.

The difference between the two hypotheses should, therefore, be quite clear. The first means that there are in man several consciousnesses usually unrelated; the latter that, though man has only one consciousness, that consciousness has a

¹ *Varieties*, p. 512.

² *Ibid.* p. 484, *italics mine*.

³ *Proceedings of Society for Psychical Research*, vol. vii (1892), pp. 305 ff.

non-conscious background which is yet more than merely physical. The subliminal strata are conceived as fully conscious, though perhaps not conscious of each other; 'all this psychical action, I hold, is fully conscious,'¹ are Myers' own words; but the subconscious strata are conceived as non-conscious. The subliminal strata represent different *selves* to that represented by the supraliminal stratum; the subconscious is simply the inactive background of the one self.

Consequently it is impossible satisfactorily to discuss a theory like Dr. Sanday's until we know definitely to which of these two conceptions he wishes to refer us. He certainly professes to base his theory on Myers' discoveries, and yet he characterizes the subliminal as 'the unconscious and semi-conscious states' (p. 137), 'the subconscious and unconscious states' (p. 144, etc.), 'the unconscious state' (p. 145), 'the lower region of the unconscious' (p. 155); and he even suggests that his hypothesis is much the same as Dr. Carpenter's 'unconscious cerebration.' No doubt the confusion goes back in part to Professor James, but perhaps that is only so far as the use of the names is concerned. But we must leave the individual theorists, and look finally at the theories themselves.

(1) What attitude are we to take to the *Subliminal*? For my own part, I am forced to consider the whole conception to be an entirely baseless one, and I would give the following as my reasons. (a) To begin with, it seems to me that part of its plausibility arises from the lack of precision in Myers' language. His usual phrase is that there is 'within us' a lower stratum which is 'conscious' but of which 'we' are not ordinarily aware. We are inclined to ask, How is it conscious if we are not aware of it? Which leads us to realize that it is only possible if we are thinking of different consciousnesses which are not conscious of each other. The only way, therefore, in which we can render Myers' view definite, is to take it as referring to two or more minds or streams of consciousness connected with the same brain, usually unaware of each other's existence, but intermingling and becoming conscious of one another in, e.g., hypnotic subjects. Now psychology does not object to hearing that two psychological individuals may represent one physiological one, that there are two minds in one body; it is not

particularly concerned with the question. But if the two individualities ever get mixed up, as in the so-called 'incursions,' then psychology very emphatically asserts that the case is a pathological one, and that the man (or men!) is—so far—mad. And a position like that is quite valueless for Myers' purposes. (b) Secondly, the evidence adduced is far from impressive. It is notorious that parts of it are constantly turning out to be based on gossip and misunderstanding and even conscious fraud. Münsterberg gives a personal reminiscence which is worth quoting: 'In Europe I received a telegram from two famous telepathists, asking me to come immediately to a small town where there had been discovered a medium of extraordinary powers. It required fifteen hours travelling, and I hesitated; but the report was so inspiring that I finally packed my trunks. Just then came a second message with the laconic words, "All fraud." Since that time I do not take the trouble to pack. I wait quietly for the second message.'² And one could quote significant admissions which come from even the most enthusiastic supporters of the theory. (c) But one prefers to press the other point, that even such part of the evidence as is verifiable can be explained on other and much simpler grounds. Hypnotism is a good instance. It seems to me that hypnotism is most naturally and easily explained on the simple theory of abnormal suggestibility, and that it is mere perverseness that makes Myers combat this explanation so indignantly, and substitute a theory of a deeper personality. Professor James is repeatedly guilty of the same error. To take only one example, he explains our sudden recollection of a forgotten name some time after we have given up the effort to recover it, by saying that 'some hidden process was started in you by the effort, which went on after the effort ceased, and made the result come as if it came spontaneously.' But surely the correct explanation is the much simpler one, that by giving up the intense effort to recollect, which is simply an effort to urge our attention along tentative and wrong associative channels, we relieve our minds of this unnatural strain, and so allow the associative mechanism to follow its natural and spontaneous course. The same thing might be said of the cases of so-called double and multiple personality; even granted the evidence,

¹ *Op. cit.* p. 305.

² *Psychology and Life*, pp. 259-260.

it does not come near to proving Myers' ambitious conclusion.

(2) Concerning the *Subconscious*, it is impossible to say very much here, as the matter is one for detailed psychological investigation. A considerable number of present-day psychologists, notably Professors Ward and Stout, make use of the conception; but, at the same time, a growing number of writers are dispensing with it, and to all appearances doing very well without it. I am very strongly inclined to follow this latter group. In the first place, the conception itself is an extremely difficult one. It is very hard to conceive a region which is at the same time mental and non-conscious; especially after we had learned to believe that, in Professor Baldwin's words, 'consciousness is the one condition and abiding characteristic of mental states.' And, of course, to give this unconscious mental region a name—to call it *subconscious*—is not to make it more explicable or conceivable. In the second place, the rise of physiological psychology has given us a real means of explaining the facts on which the theory is based. There is no reason why we should not regard all unconscious processes as also non-mental, and so leave them entirely to the brain. If the so-called subconscious states are unconscious, surely it is at least as easy to conceive them as brain states, as it is to conceive them as states of some unknown intermediary sphere.

We are now in a position to see just where it is that James' account of decisions, sudden conversions, etc., as the entry into consciousness of the completed result of a subconscious process, is mistaken. If the process is there at all, there is no reason to think that it is anything else than a brain-process, and, moreover, the whole analysis of

the case is wrong. 'Sudden' conversions are not usually so sudden as James supposes them; they are usually the result of a long process of 'quenching the Spirit.' The thought that finally issues in the man's conversion has suggested itself to him—appeared on the verge of consciousness—a hundred times, but he has always impatiently or angrily suppressed it. And then at last it overpowers him—the culmination being due to the appearance of some new intensifying condition. It was a bright light which convinced the doubt-tortured Paul that he could kick against the pricks no longer, long and wilfully though he had kicked against them. And besides this, James seems not to realize how powerful is the new motive that comes in in conversion; so powerful as to explain the greatest wonders of suddenness and completeness and permanency. Add to this the fact that the most sudden conversions usually take place in highly emotional, not to say ecstatic, subjects, as in the classical cases of Mohammed and Paul, and the explanation seems complete.

One regrets that this discussion should be so largely destructive and so little constructive in its results, though the *idola theatri* are after all the idols which one least minds destroying, and though this lack of proportion never caused a twinge of conscience—or shall we say of subconsciousness, of that *δαιμόνιον* of his which Myers thought he understood so well?—to so good a man as Socrates. The mysteries and the subtleties of the religious consciousness are indeed crying aloud on every side for patient investigation and analysis; and there is nothing we need so much to this end as a new psychology of religion, at the same time more enlightened and more cautious. But we shall surely be disappointed if we look for help to the Subliminal Consciousness.

The Word of the Cross and the Parable of the Prodigal.

BY THE REV. J. BONNAR RUSSELL, B.D., ABERDEEN.

It has often been remarked that in the Parable of the Prodigal Son the principle of atonement finds no place. The reconciliation of father and son is a simple matter of repentance on the one hand, and

forgiveness on the other. There is no question of a price paid by either—much less by a third party—before reconciliation can take place. There is nothing to show the need of any sacrifice, to

satisfy the father's sense of justice and open up the way for the prodigal's return.

From this the alternative follows: *either* the preaching of atonement is unnecessary, *or* the parable does not convey the gospel. The aim of this paper is first of all to show that the parable by no means conveys, or even professes to convey, the gospel; but the further, and more important, aim is to show that the parable renders the preaching of the atonement necessary. For it raises questions which the Cross answers. It creates needs which the Cross satisfies.

It may be freely admitted, to begin with, that if the parable conveys the gospel, then to preach the atonement is a waste of time—is, indeed, worse than useless. For to insist upon the atonement may start difficulties which will yield only to a complicated process of thought. Experience has taught that a satisfactory theory of the atonement is very difficult to shape, and often hard to grasp. Why expose an awakened sinner to these difficulties? Why impose a doctrine of atonement upon a mind already burdened? Why not rather simply say: 'There is your Father; He waits to be gracious; go to Him and say, Father, I have sinned'?

The answer to these questions is, of course, that they ignore the real problem. A false simplicity is imparted to the situation by leaving its real difficulties out of account.

For one thing. Suppose your prodigal is not at all repentant? Not every prodigal comes to rags and want. Some of the worst of prodigals are in flourishing circumstances, and not a bit ashamed of themselves. How to make them ashamed?

Again. Suppose your prodigal to be as miserable and conscience-stricken as you please. Is it the invariable, or even the usual, result of such a state to lead him back to God? Are not hopelessness, despair, and efforts to forget at least as common? The difficulty in this case is to replace this hopelessness with a firm assurance of God's mercy. Well, it may be argued, what could be better designed to impart such assurance than the parable itself? But, as a matter of fact, does the parable suffice for this purpose? One thinks of Bunyan walking in the fields round Elstow envying the beasts of the field because they had no souls to be condemned eternally. Surely Bunyan could have read the parable and taken comfort.

Why not? Because the character of the father in the story did not fit in with other statements about God which he found in the Bible. In the parable he read God's mercy, but in a hundred other places he read of God's justice. The one was as real as the other. For him the trouble was that he was sure of the one, but not sure of the other. One remembers Dr. Johnson also. 'Have you forgotten the merits of your Saviour?' the sad old man was asked one day. 'No, sir. I have not forgotten the merits of my Saviour. But I remember that my Saviour said that some would be on His left hand in the day of judgment.' Here, then, is another class of cases for which the parable offers no sufficient gospel.

Once again. What security does the parable hold out that the prodigal's amendment will be lasting? The curtain falls on the happy reunion of father and son. It goes down to the sounds of music and dancing. But what of the days to come? The feast must make way for the routine of life. The younger brother must take his place with the elder in the labours of field and farm. Will he take kindly to the new life? Will the old sing no seductive songs in his heart? Will it take no 'glory from its being far'? He has changed his way of life. Is his heart changed? In a word, is forgiving love, such as the father's in the story, a *redemptive power*? We know that in real life it seldom is. Here again, then, is a situation, only too common in actual experience, for which no provision is made in the story.

Of the parable, therefore, this is our conclusion: As a tender, domestic tale—how beautiful! For those penitents who already know God as their Father—how consoling! But as a gospel for a world of sin—how inadequate!

No! the parable is not the gospel, but only one feature of the gospel—the free, forgiving grace of God. And that feature is isolated for a particular purpose, as the context shows. It was indeed a message of grace to the publicans and sinners that 'drew near for to hear him.' But it was, no less, a withering rebuke to the scribes and Pharisees who murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.

Our first aim has now, we hope, been accomplished. We have tried to show that the parable cannot be read as a full declaration of the gospel. There are circumstances in which it finds no application. There are conditions to which it has no

appeal. There are states of mind for which it carries no message.

Our second, and more positive, aim still remains. This was, to show that the parable reaches forward to the preaching of the atonement. It prepares the way for it. It creates the need for it. It leads us to look forward to the Cross of Christ and helps us to understand its meaning. The parable, in short, like all the rest of Christ's preaching, is part of the prolegomena of the gospel—not the gospel itself, which is the Word of the Cross.

1. Repentance and faith are integral parts of the preaching of the Cross. Now, repentance and faith are both exhibited by the prodigal. But both are very imperfect. That is an imperfect repentance which is rooted in the comparison of his own condition with that of his father's servants. That is an imperfect faith which returns to the father with an offer of hired service. The mind feels the need of something which will secure a deeper repentance and a more self-abandoning faith. This is supplied in the Cross of Christ.

2. The preaching of the Cross claims to reveal the whole nature of God—not a part of it, nor a side of it, but the whole. In the parable we have, certainly, a wonderful picture of love and mercy; but it is a picture which leaves some important matters entirely in the shade. What sort of man was this father? Wonderfully tender and kind, it is plain. But was he a man of principle? Did he merely miss and long for his son, or did he feel in his inmost soul the sense of his son's moral degradation? Had he nothing to get over? No moral repulsion to overcome? Was there, or was there not, a side of his nature, pure and high, which felt his son's 'dishonour like a wound'? Does one not feel that, if the father was as pure as he was kind, as high-souled as he was tender, a great anger must have struggled with his great love; that forgiveness would be no easy thing but a grand moral victory. Of this moral conflict the story bears no trace. As to whether absent or merely con-

cealed, the mind can tolerate uncertainty, since it is 'only a story.' But the mind can tolerate no such uncertainty in regard to God. It looks for traces of a struggle, for tokens of a victory. And it finds them in the Cross of Christ.

3. The preaching of the Cross purports to reveal, not only the holy love of God, but also 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.' In the parable there is no trace of this. There is, on the contrary, an absence of this, so great and glaring, as to rouse the inward demand for it. There is the hard, cold, unforgiving elder brother, who neither grieves for his father's grief, nor mourns his brother's loss. Self-centred, correct and regular, the last thing he would have thought of doing would be to go away and follow his brother to the far country, and seek to win him back to the paternal roof. The mind regards this forbidding figure with repulsion. The very strength of repulsion suggests a figure of an opposite kind—a redemptive, brotherly influence issuing from the heavenly Father's house, and stooping to the lowest level to raise the lost brother from the mire. The mind feels such a figure to be a divine necessity. It looks for something of the kind in the history of the divine dealings with an erring race. And what it seeks, it finds—in the Cross of Christ.

That is what we mean by saying that the parable raises questions which the Cross answers, and creates needs which the Cross satisfies. So far from rendering the preaching of the Cross superfluous, it renders such preaching necessary. There is no express teaching about the Cross in the parable—though we must not forget that, as in the case of all Christ's preaching, so in this case too, the influence of the Speaker's *personality* must always be added to that of His words—but the effect of the parable still is, what beyond doubt it was intended to be for all receptive minds, to rouse in our hearts a great need for the Cross, and to help our minds in the effort to interpret the Cross.

Literature.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

IT is sometimes said that the man upon whom the mantle of Professor A. B. Davidson has fallen is the Rev. James Strahan, M.A. It was therefore fitting, perhaps it was inevitable, that his studies should be directed to the Book of Job, and that when the time was ripe he should give us a new commentary on that great and wonderful book. For it is by his Commentary on Job that Professor Davidson is best known. Now we see that he did more than expound the book, he also inspired his students to study it for themselves and expound it to their own generation. The title is *The Book of Job*, interpreted by James Strahan, M.A., sometime Hebrew Tutor, New College, Edinburgh (T. & T. Clark ; 7s. 6d. net).

It is a greater book than Professor Davidson's *Job*. Those of us who so narrowly escaped idolatry in our love for the beloved Rabbi, will say so more readily than others. For we know better, and we are glad that it should be so. Professor Davidson himself would have been before us all in his appreciation. How he would have rejoiced in the finish of its scholarship, the comprehensiveness of its grasp, its imaginative penetration, its devout affection. How happy would he have been to recognize in this incomparable example of Biblical scholarship the fruit of his own teaching, the crown of the earnest, unsparing toil of his own life. And of all things he would have rejoiced most in its vindication of that maxim which he taught and practised always, that the closest walk with God is possible only to the man whose study of the Word of God is most fearless and critical.

THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

Let us transcribe the title in full: *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions and Facsimiles of Inscriptions and Maps*, by the Rev. S. R. Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford ; Hon. D.Litt. (Cambridge and Dublin) ; Hon. D.D. (Glasgow and Aberdeen) ; Fellow of the British Academy ; Corresponding Member of the Royal Prussian Academy of

Sciences. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged (Oxford : At the Clarendon Press, 1913 ; 12s. net).

We transcribe the title-page in full because of the importance of the book, and of this the second edition of the book ; also because it is necessary to know all that the book professes to contain. For it will not be found to contain what it does not profess to contain, but all that it does profess to contain will be found in it to utmost satisfaction. This leads us to say at once that one of the surprises of the book is the low price at which it is published.

It is twenty-three years, Dr. Driver tells us, since the first edition appeared. In that time there has been no such epoch-making work published as Wellhausen's *History of Israel* (1878). The lines on which the new edition is laid down are therefore the same as before. Nevertheless an enormous amount of first-rate work has been done on the Old Testament. Dr. Driver mentions, as chiefly significant, Nowack and Marti's two series of Commentaries, the 'International Critical Commentary,' the Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, Kautzsch's editions of Gesenius' *Hebrew Grammar*, two of which have been translated into English (1898, 1910), Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, G. A. Cooke's *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, and the *Papyri of Assuan and Elephantinē* (Sayce and Cowley, 1906 ; Sachau, 1911).

The new edition exceeds the first by more than 100 pages. The additional space is not accounted for entirely by the new material on the text and the language : Professor Driver has given particular attention to the topography of the Books of Samuel. In this connexion it has to be said that the maps are a special feature of this edition. They are four in number, and it is unquestionable that they supersede all the maps covering the same ground that are already published anywhere. The readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES do not need to be told of Dr. Driver's interest in the geography of the Holy Land.

The preface to the second edition closes with a short but highly useful note on conjectural emendation. It is a matter of utmost interest at the present time. Not a few are asking whether Dr. Driver is at all impressed by the persistency with

which the cause of Yerahmeel is advocated. The answer is that Yerahmeel occurs but once in the book, and that occurrence is so brief that it may be quoted: 'Yerahme'el was the name of a clan allied to that of the Calebites; both were afterwards absorbed into the tribe of Judah.'

On the other hand, we could give many examples of the liberty which Dr. Driver exercises in the carrying out of what he believes to be the true principles of textual emendation. There is, for example, a difficult word in 1 S 15. In the A.V. it is translated *worthy*—'But unto Hannah he gave a worthy portion; for he loved Hannah: but the Lord had shut up her womb.' This comes from the Geneva Version, and is based ultimately upon the Targum, which reads 'one *choice* portion.' But it is no translation of the Hebrew word, nor can it be derived from it by any intelligible process. The Great Bible has *heavy* (that is, *sad*), after the Vulgate (*tristis*), but this also has no support in the usage of the word. At last, after a most lucid exposition, Dr. Driver comes to the conclusion that the Hebrew text does not admit of a defensible reading. He accordingly makes a slight verbal change which is supported by the Septuagint, and obtains the translation: 'But unto Hannah he used to give *one* portion'—for Hannah was but one, having no children. Lest we should think that thus Elkanah slighted Hannah, it is added, '*Howbeit* he loved Hannah; but Yahweh had shut up her womb.'

We have said enough. Our object is to direct the attention of all students of Hebrew to the new edition of this great book.

DEVELOPMENT AND PURPOSE.

Professor L. T. Hobhouse has been working at the philosophy of evolution for twenty-six years. He has been working in his own way, calling no man master and attaching himself to no school. For he had not been long at work when he saw that although Herbert Spencer was himself no materialist, his philosophical extension of the theory of evolution did not rescue that theory from some of the worst consequences of a materialistic system. To Spencer the mind of man was simply an organ, like the lungs or the liver, evolved in the struggle for existence. 'The Genus *Homo* had its place in geological time like other genera, and like them would pass away; only, unlike them, its fossil remains would never become a

theme for the antiquary, because in the cooling of the earth there would be no antiquarians. The teeming life of the world must gradually disappear and give place in time to the primordial silence.'

Relief from this catastrophe was sought by T. H. Green (whose influence, together with that of the late Master of Balliol, was dominant in Oxford and in the English and Scottish Universities generally in the eighties and early nineties) in a modified Hegelianism, or a form of Kantianism, in which what was best in the Hegelian criticism was incorporated, and a spiritual conception of human life and of the entire world order seemed possible and able to maintain itself against science. But Mr. Hobhouse could not regard reality as all spiritual; and, besides that, he felt certain that physical science had somehow or other to be included in a complete view of the universe.

He determined to interrogate consciousness—the consciousness of the lower animals so far as it could be discovered, but especially the consciousness of man; and, proceeding by a strictly empirical method, he hoped to prove that the mind has developed along the lines of physical evolution but not within these lines, and thus escape the despair of materialism and the dreaded approach of the end of all things. And after this method he published a number of books which are well known to students of philosophy.

But he has recently found that his method was a mistake. It was a mistake because he had left out God. 'In point of fact,' he says, 'I was at first opposed to anything like a theistic or teleological interpretation of reality as a whole, as inconsistent with the mechanical causation which I took to be the ultimate category of science.'

He has come to the conclusion that before beginning to observe and classify the phenomena of the mind he ought to have discerned a purpose, which involves a mind capable of forming that purpose, and an end toward which that mind desires to direct all things. Mr. Hobhouse is still not quite emancipated. He fears to postulate a mind that is unconditioned or a reality that is Spiritual (with a capital S). But he does see, and he has written his new book to show, that 'there is a spiritual element integral to the structure and movement of Reality, and that evolution is the process by which this principle makes itself master of the residual conditions which at first dominate its life and thwart its efforts.'

The title of the new book is *Development and Purpose* (Macmillan; 10s. net).

THE MODERATORS.

A history of *The Moderators of the Church of Scotland from 1690 to 1740* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 10s. 6d. net) is a history of the Church of Scotland for that period. In the hands of the Rev. John Warrick, M.A., it is even something more. For biography such as this is history and biography both, nothing being taken from the historical science, the human interest being simply added to it. The book is even more than a history of its period. For, as the author says, the Moderators whose biographies it contains lived, some of them long before, and some of them long after, the period named. Thus the biographies of these twenty-seven men abound in references to events in which they played a part that are spread over more than a hundred years of Scotland's chequered life.

Mr. Warrick has a good opinion of his Moderators. There were lesser men among them, but there were more men who were truly great. And it does not affect their greatness that few of them are known to fame. One thing was much commented on at the time, especially by English writers, and is sometimes misunderstood still—they did very little in the way of writing books. Mr. Warrick gives an excellent reason for it. They were too much occupied after the Revolution in setting their house in order. They were compelled to be men of affairs.

Mr. Warrick has not only a good opinion of the Moderators, he has a good opinion of their time. Dr. Chalmers, in his Correspondence with Lord Aberdeen, says: 'It should never be forgotten that the Church was never more efficient as a Christian and moral institute than from 1690 to 1712, and that, in opposition to the lying preamble of Queen Anne's Act for the restoration of patronage, there had only occurred fourteen disputed cases.' On the other hand, Professor MacEwen, in his monograph on *Antoinette Bourignon*, states: 'In Scotland after the Revolution Settlement, religion was singularly dry, harsh, and pedantic. . . . There probably never was a time when Presbyterianism showed less of its strength and more of its weakness.' Mr. Warrick takes the side of Dr. Chalmers, and at considerable length, for he has unearthed

much curious evidence, gives reasons in favour of the spiritual life and evangelical preaching of the time.

The whole book shows the results of the most persevering investigation. Hundreds of out-of-the-way books and thousands of still more out-of-the-way sermons have been read and every fact in them taken note of. And it is manifest that there was much need for care and research. Hill Burton actually calls Gabriel Cunningham, instead of Hew Kennedie, the first Moderator after the Revolution Settlement, an error which Principal Story strangely perpetuates.

The volume is a valuable contribution to the history of the Church of Scotland, and it was right to produce it in this handsome and attractive form.

HISTORY OF ENGLISH NONCONFORMITY.

Mr. Henry W. Clark, who has already written many books, has now written his great book. It is not every man who has the courage, it is not every man who has the equipment, to undertake so tremendous a task as the writing of a complete *History of English Nonconformity from Wyclif to the Close of the Nineteenth Century* (Chapman & Hall; 2 vols., each 15s. net). Mr. Clark has both. And he has nearly all the other qualifications that are necessary. He is a student of religious history, well versed in the efforts of the nations to build each in its own place the City of God. He is an Englishman, loyal to the heart's core of him to the high calling with which God has called the Anglo-Saxon race. And he is a Nonconformist, in whole-hearted sympathy with the ideals, in full awareness of the defects, of modern English Nonconformity. Last of all he is a Christian; he writes as always in the great Taskmaster's eye, without bias or ill-intent, so far as that is possible for man.

In an introduction to the first volume Mr. Clark explains the spirit which animates the true and ardent Nonconformist. In a sentence, it is that spirit which exalts life above organization, and declares that life must make organization, not organization life. To the Conformist organization comes first, and he is possessed with the idea that in linking himself with the organization life is secure. The organization is often called simply the Church, within which alone can life be found. The Nonconformist insists that life is first, both in importance and in time. Not only so, but there must be

no organization except that which comes out of life and is necessary for its expression. It is necessary to insist upon this, because organization, being the more concrete of the two things, is always apt to obtain more than its share of attention and influence.

It is in the light of this conception of Nonconformity that the whole book is written. As we have already said, Mr. Clark is no blind partisan. He is aware of the advantages of Conformity, especially in dealing with large numbers of people. He is also aware of the great difficulty that always lies and always will lie in applying the Nonconformist ideal, owing to the diversity of gifts and the perversity of the human mind. He is, moreover, well aware that throughout its history Nonconformity has often fallen far below its own possibilities and sometimes even lost sight of its aim. But in spite of defect and even defection, the history of Nonconformity, in Mr. Clark's hands, is a great history. There never has been wanting the occasion for self-sacrifice, and with the occasion there have always appeared the men and the women. So much is this the case that to not a few of us Nonconformity has seemed to be simply a protest. The Conformist being always in the majority, the Nonconformist has appeared as if simply protesting against some special abuse of the majority's power, and suffering the consequence of difference. The reading of this book makes that opinion ridiculous. But it does not take away the sense of sympathy which must always be given to suffering heroically endured. Mr. Clark makes it abundantly evident that less persecution would have meant less Nonconformity. But, after all, that is not the essential matter. The Nonconformist spirit, the determination to seek life first, would always have impelled some men to Nonconformity. And the certainty is that it will always have that effect in the future.

This therefore is a thing worthy the attention of all men in a day in which the desire for religious and ecclesiastical union is so strong. Were union obtained it seems that some quite unusual safeguards would have to be discovered to prevent outward organization from encroaching on inward life, otherwise the union is not likely to be of long duration.

After the long day of depression men are speaking now with confidence on every theological

subject that touches physical science. They are speaking out with confidence on Creation, on Providence, on Prayer, and even on Miracle. A small book called *An Essay on Miracle*, by the Rev. Geoffrey Hughes, M.A., Vicar of Woolston, Southampton (Arnold; 2s. 6d. net), is a book of rejoicing, and we cannot say that its author rejoices with trembling. In the presence of God he is in fear; in the presence of the interpretation of God's work he is cheerful and confident. His line of argument, as he himself has found, closely resembles that of Bergson, though he came to it independently. Its centre of interest is in the discovery of the interchange of energy in spirit and matter. This discovery seems to make every miracle a natural event. Thus the walking on the water is accomplished by the outgoing energy of will in Christ being sufficient to counteract gravity. And it will seem to some as if this were to do away with miracles altogether. But it is certainly in line with the use made of miracles by our Lord, and with the name He gave them. In any case the argument deserves to be diligently considered.

Sanctuary Booklet No. 7 is *The Private Devotions of Bishop Andrewes*, as translated by Dean Stanhope (Allenson; 6d. net).

The Very Rev. Benedict Zimmerman, Discalced Carmelite, is doing good service to the lover of the Mystics in having new translations made or old translations revised of some of their most characteristic but least accessible works. His latest service is a thorough revision of the translation which was made from the Spanish by Mr. David Lewis of *The Book of the Foundations of S. Teresa of Jesus* (Baker; 7s. 6d. net). Mr. Lewis published his translation in 1871. This is the second edition of it. But with Dr. Zimmerman's additional notes and valuable introduction it is more like a new book. The latest edition of the works of S. Teresa in French appeared in six volumes from 1907 to 1910, of which vols. iii. and iv. are devoted to the 'Book of Foundations.' That edition has a great store of critical and biographical notes and a host of new documents, all of which the editor of the present English edition has drawn upon at will. More than that, he has used documents gathered by himself in a long journey through Italy and Spain.

Besides the Foundations, this volume contains the 'Visitation of the Nunneries,' the 'Carmelite Rule,' and the 'Constitutions.'

Messrs. George Bell & Sons have issued a charming edition of Anthony Trollope's *Phineas Finn* and *Phineas Redux*, each in two volumes (3s. 6d. net each volume). The books are just the size and weight for comfortable handling, the type is clear, and the binding is chaste and strong. We have read the four volumes carefully and have found a few trifling slips of the printer which might be attended to before the next reprint.

Professor G. A. Cooke, who writes the Commentary on *The Books of Judges and Ruth* for the new series of the Cambridge Bible in which the Revised Version is used (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2s. 6d. net), offers us a fine example of what the minute study of the Old Testament, for which the last half century has been notable, has done for its interpretation. This it has done above all things else, it has set us in the atmosphere of the writers. Patient investigation has recovered that atmosphere. And it is all gain. Only the impious can regret the loss of the old pious idea of a people so peculiar that they were scarcely human. The people whom the Judges 'judged' were very human indeed. And, not to speak of Christ, even the prophets have made a difference in the world's idea of God and duty.

We thank Professor Cooke that he has never let the trees hide the wood. With all his minuteness of archæological reference and textual suggestion, he remembers that even the Books of Judges and Ruth were written beforehand for our learning.

Two of the publications of the University of Chicago, though appearing in the undress of paper covers, deserve notice for their sincere scholarship. One was submitted by Miss Ella Harrison Stokes in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Its title as now published is *The Conception of a Kingdom of Ends in Augustine, Aquinas, and Leibniz*. The subjects discussed are (1) Augustine and the 'City of God'; (2) Aquinas and the Universal Church; (3) Leibniz and the Kingdom of Grace; and there is (4) A Summary and Statement of Relation to Kant.

The other volume is an investigation into *The*

Sources of Luke's Perean Section, by Dean Rockwell Wickes, Ph.D. Both volumes are published in this country by the Cambridge University Press, as Agents for the University of Chicago Press.

The Religion of a Student, by Lancelot Feilding Eyerest, M.A., LL.D., Barrister-at-Law (Deighton Bell & Co.; 2s. net), is very good religion. For it is the religion of the Bible. It is the religion of the Bible sifted certainly; but do we not all sift now and select? Dr. Everest has little confidence in the Fourth Gospel, little in the third, and little in the first. But confining himself to the second Gospel, he has enough to build a robust faith upon and he builds it. He is much influenced by the *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, an excellent book, but not so good as the New Testament.

Professor Margoliouth has introduced a volume which, under the title of *Kurds and Christians* (Wells Gardner; 3s. 6d. net), tells the tale of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Nestorians. A wonderful tale it is. For the Nestorians are a wonderful people, a survival in the providence of God and in spite of the barbarity of Kurd and Turk, to testify to the early zeal of the followers of the Lord, and the unquenchable light of the gospel. The tale is told by many writers, each of whom signs his or her contribution with initials. The method gives variety, a relief which would often be welcome in books on missions, and the editor has prevented the variety from dropping into discursiveness. Of the contributions, all sufficiently alive, one of the most lively is the description of the school at Urmia. 'The boy sits on the carpet, and if he has to write, holds his paper on his knees, using a reed pen, and very thick ink, which is laid on freely for the broad Syriac letters. His stone inkpot, pens, paper, New Testament, and grammar or spelling book which have been bought from the Apostles, he keeps in a box secured by a padlock. Our boy sits quiet and attentive in class, partly from a wholesome dread of a stick which the chief Apostle of the school wields, partly because he really has learned good manners in the school. He has no fear of his Rabbis in any bad sense; he likes them, and does not give them cause for complaint. If our boy were in the upper school as a deacon, or an "unordained deacon," as the big boys are playfully called, and were refractory, he might be "poured

into prison," *videlicet*, confined for two or three hours, or even for the whole day, in a dark room used for storing wood. Sometimes it is asked: "Rabbi, do you imprison deacons in England?" It is difficult to explain that London curates who might whisper at a clerical meeting are not often confined in a coal-cellar.'

The book is edited by the Rev. F. N. Heazell, M.A., and Mrs. Margoliouth.

Mr. Francis Griffiths has published a fresh imaginative volume of sermons for children, of which the author is the Rev. Francis G. Burgess, M.A., and the title *Little Beginnings* (3s. 6d. net). From first to last the sermons are all about little things. The most striking, we think, warns little boys and little girls about 'Little Weak Spots.' The sermons are longer than they ought to be, but the well-placed anecdote always delivers them from dulness.

A short and authoritative statement of what the Quakers believe will be found in a little book called *The Message and Mission of Quakerism* (Headley Brothers; 1s. net). It is short; for it consists of two addresses delivered at the Five Years' Meeting of the Society of Friends held in Indianapolis from October 15 to 22, 1912, the one by Mr. W. C. Braithwaite, LL.B., the other by Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A., M.B. And it is authoritative; for the addresses were approved by a Minute and ordered to be published.

The translator of Professor Augustus Brassac's *Student's Handbook to the Study of the New Testament* (Herder; 10s. 6d. net) makes an amazing confession in introducing the book to English readers. 'It is a sad commentary,' he says, 'on the scholarship of the Scripturists of the Church, both in England and America, that we possess, in the whole realm of English Catholic literature, no reliable and scholarly Introduction to the New Testament.' He himself, the Rev. Joseph L. Weidenhan, S.T.L., resolved to wipe out this reproach. But a friend asked him if he had seen Professor Brassac's book, which had been so successful in France. When he saw it, he resolved to translate it instead, and thereby fill the glaring gap, though it covers no more of the New Testament than the four Gospels.

He has translated it well. And as a strictly

popular work, a work which expects very little knowledge of the Gospels from its readers, it is well worth translating. The author is limited in his knowledge of literature, and although the translator has added an excellent array of authorities, especially English authorities, throughout the book, he has not tampered with the text, beyond making some omissions and rearrangements, so that its somewhat narrow outlook is everywhere apparent. But it is a step in the right direction; and a great step. In one respect it surpasses all our Introductions: it is admirably illustrated and just at the places in the narrative or exposition where an illustration is required.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have reprinted from the *British Weekly* the papers which have appeared there on the League of Young Worshippers. The papers are chiefly the work of Sir William Robertson Nicoll, partly of the Rev. J. Williams Butcher. The title of the booklet is *The Children for the Church* (6d. net).

Out of a study of Thomas Campion's *Observations in the Art of English Poesie*, a study undertaken as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts at University College, Dublin, Mr. Thomas MacDonagh, M.A., has developed a considerable treatise on English metre. The work has been published with the title *Thomas Campion and the Art of English Poetry* (Hodges; 3s. 6d. net). It is two books in one volume instead of the usual two volumes in one book. Those who know Thomas Campion will enjoy the selections taken from his poetry and the criticism of his criticisms. Those who are initiated into the mysteries of English metre will be most attracted by the second part of the volume, in which they will find a fresh mind heroically endeavouring to explain the inexplicable.

Principal H. B. Workman, M.A., D.Lit., has written a new book on the same general subject as his *Persecution in the Early Church*, but addressed to a different class of readers. It is more popular, in short. But its scholarship, if unobtrusive, is reliable. The title is *The Martyrs of the Early Church* (Kelly; 2s. net).

At the Methodist Book Room there has been undertaken the issue of a series of cheap volumes

dealing with living questions in religion. Three volumes of the series have been published—*The Psychology of the Christian Life*, by the Rev. Eric S. Waterhouse, M.A., B.D.; *Miracles: An Outline of the Christian View*, by the Rev. Frederic Platt, M.A., B.D.; and *The Hymns of Methodism in their Literary Relations*, by the Rev. Henry Bett (Kelly; 1s. net each). In outward appearance the volumes resemble the Cambridge series, and the work in them is not less scholarly or less opportune. Small though the books are, not one of these authors has done his work indifferently.

The Master of Life is a great and unappropriated title. It is the title of a volume of sermons by the Rev. F. Warburton Lewis (Kelly; 2s. 6d. net)—a volume of exegetical expository critical and practical sermons. For Mr. Lewis is always 'learn, learning,' and nothing comes amiss to him that has to do with the elucidation of the Word. To all the adjectives which have been applied to the sermons there is yet one to be added. They are imaginative, and once or twice amazingly imaginative. Mr. Lewis dares to rewrite the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and sends the elder brother out to find the younger and bring him home!

The 'Century Bible' is at last complete with the issue of *The Book of Daniel*, as edited by R. H. Charles, D.Litt., D.D. (Jack; 2s. 6d. net). And it must be a satisfaction to editors and publishers that with the issue of the final volume the success of the series is fully assured. Dr. Charles on Daniel by coming sooner would have hastened its success. Now, however, he will do something to keep the series alive and useful. Needless to say Daniel is here handled without respect or prejudice. Will there still be found persons who cling to its early date and authenticity?

Canon Newbolt is at his best when he is acting as 'pastor pastorum.' And he seems to have found it out himself. Every word he speaks is instinct with spirit and life; every warning or encouragement is the fruit of that endurance of hardness for the gospel's sake which the shepherd of shepherds must not escape. The strange thing is that he who is often difficult to follow when preaching popularly is easy and unmistakable when speaking to 'pastors and teachers.' His

new book on *The Ministry of the Word* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net) is as fresh as if he had never published a word on the subject.

Messrs. Sampson Low have now issued *The English Catalogue of Books for 1912* (6s. net). It contains a complete list of the books published in Great Britain and Ireland during that year. And as it is the only list that is published with any claim to completeness, it may with strict accuracy be called indispensable. The volume contains also the publications of the learned societies, together with the names and addresses of the publishers, not only of Great Britain and Ireland, but also of the United States and Canada. In one volume and under one alphabetical arrangement it is at once an authors' and a subject catalogue, the authors' names being in clarendon and the subject titles in roman type. This is more convenient than Hinrichs or Lorenz, the great German and French catalogues.

The volume entitled *Repton School Sermons* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net) contains not a selection from but all the sermons which the Rev. William Temple preached to the boys of Repton School during his first two years as Headmaster. Since he is one of the authors of that much-talked-of book *Foundations*, we are not surprised at Mr. Temple's courage. We are not surprised at the determination to shirk no living issue, which is evident throughout the book. What does surprise us is the tenderness with which boy nature, and even the nature of every particular boy, is studied and guided and borne with. Mr. Temple tells us that he has made three discoveries about boys: they understand a great deal more than they get credit for, they have a strong mystical tendency, and their most conspicuous good quality is generosity.

Although Mr. W. R. Halliday, B.A., B.Litt., has given his book (his first book?) the title of *Greek Divination* (Macmillan; 5s. net), that title does not describe it well. Round the Divination which the Greeks practised he has gathered so many interesting things about Magic and the rudiments of Religion everywhere that the book is really an introduction to the study of primitive Religion. He has read widely, and he has made excellent artistic use of his reading. For he has

the unconscious gift of English style, and can set forth his findings attractively. It is curious, however, that with all his reading Mr. Halliday has missed the most authoritative, richest, and most recent work on his subject.

There are many things in the book which the expositor of the Bible will take a note of. The story of the cleansing of Naaman, for example, is illustrated strikingly, and at the same time its truly religious worth is made to be seen in contrast to the mere magic of other cases of healing by water. This is altogether in line with the new *religious* study of the Bible, and very welcome.

There is no book of the month that for the union of intellectual liberty with spiritual momentum excels *The Prayer Life* of the Rev. J. G. James, D.Lit., M.A. (Meyer; 2s. 6d. net). Yet it is a small book, just touching the 200th page. But not a word in it is wasted. The things about prayer which may be taken for granted are taken for granted, the things which must be argued still are argued with convincing clearness and goodwill. Dr. James has recognized the new place we occupy in relation to natural law since Eucken's and Bergson's and James Ward's work has been done. He has also discerned the importance of that little book by Professor A. G. Hogg, called *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, which sets the whole subject in a new light, and gives to prayer a new emphasis. There never was an opener way to the practice of prayer, there never was a wider desire to practise it. This book comes for conviction and obedience.

'Give me a short argument for missions.'—'Pastor Hsi.' Messrs. Morgan & Scott have issued a cheap edition of Mrs. Howard Taylor's *Pastor Hsi* (pronounce as Shee) of *North China* (6d. net).

A short, a pointed, and, so far as we are able to judge, an accurate history of education in Scotland, is to be found in a book which has been written by the Rev. John Smith, D.D., Hon. F.E.I.S. The title of the book is *Broken Links in Scottish Education* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net), for its chief object is to show that there have been and still are defects in the educational system of Scotland.

Dr. Wilfred T. Grenfell, although a medical man, is not ashamed to preach sermons, and he is not

afraid to publish them. *What Life Means to Me* (Nisbet; 2s. net), his latest book, contains four sermons, one on Life, one on Faith, one on the Church, and one on the Lord Jesus Christ. They are both edifying and entertaining, and they are 'sound on the fundamentals.'

The writer of essays is as peculiarly gifted as the writer of poetry, and it would be easy to maintain that he is as useful a member of society. Like the poet the essayist must have thoughts, and his thoughts must be neither very ordinary nor very original. He must also have style, his own style, fitted to his own thoughts. One thing he must have which the poet need not trouble about, he must have the appearance of familiarity without being familiar.

Mr. A. C. Benson is the best representative we have of the pure type of essayist. He is in the Addisonian succession, and can sincerely say, but knows better than to say it, that he has improved upon all his teachers. He is versatile, which means that he is alive. He is religious and almost theological. He is scientific, artistic, literary. And it does not matter a straw what topic he takes up—it is by the blowing of a straw he finds it—he writes pleasantly and does us good.

Mr. Benson's new book is called *Along the Road* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). Some of us have read every word of it already, for it has all appeared in the *Church Family Newspaper*. And this enables us to say of it, what would otherwise have been impossible, that these occasional, so accidental, essays are literature. For we have found it in our power to read them steadily over again; we have found ourselves doing it and spending upon it much well-spent time.

A volume of twenty sermons by the Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., has been published by Messrs. Ouseley under the title of *The Humanity of Christ* (3s. 6d. net). Dr. Plummer tells us in his Preface that they have been chosen by Mr. J. H. Burn out of a larger number submitted to him. We do not know those that have been left over; we appreciate the loyalty manifest in every one of those that have been chosen. The loyalty is to the Gospel and to truth. This is, without reservation, to be called evangelical preaching, and nothing is said that has not been verified in life. There is a sermon on the use of the imagination in recognizing

the claims of missions that is especially notable. Dr. Plummer quotes the Swiss proverb, 'Behind the mountains also there are people,' and uses it without exaggeration or abuse to bring home to us the necessity of realizing, first, the very existence of those in far lands for whom Christ died, and, next, the fact that Christianity alone can do the two things most urgent in this world—cure sin and comfort in death.

The Poetical Compendium contains 'three centuries of the best English verse.' The book has been compiled by Mr. D. R. Broadbent. It is published by Messrs. Heath, Cranton & Ouseley (6s. net). It is not for the originality of its idea that it claims our regard, nor for the catholicity of its quotations; but for its beauty as a book. Evidently birthdays and such-like occasions for giving gifts were in the mind of editor and publisher. The page is a quarto, with broad white margins; the binding is green cloth, with cream-coloured buckram for the back; the illustrations are on plate paper. If there is no earlier event, keep it in mind for next Christmas.

The Rev. A. W. Greenup, D.D., Litt.D., has edited *The Yalkut of R. Machir bar Abba Mari on Joel, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Malachi* from the unique manuscript (Harley, 5704) in the British Museum (Palestine House, Rodney Road, London, N.E.).

The patriot to whom patriotism means the prayer of the chaplain of the Senate on the morning after the Venezuelan message, 'Grant, Lord, that we may be quick to resent insults,' should not read the New Testament nor Mrs. Mead's *Swords and Ploughshares* (Putnam; 6s. net). For either he will lose his peace of mind or change the object of his petitions, and these are both painful experiences. He had better not even look at Mrs. Mead's illustrations. What a case can be made out against war, and what a horror it is when the camera is directed upon it.

If Mrs. Mead were not so utterly in earnest, if she were not so careful of her facts, we should call her simply a literary artist. To her, however, war is not art, it is death. But the virtues it trains, and the music of it? The virtues she does not find, but the music she feels, and quotes Richard le Gallienne's poem with feeling.

War
I abhor;
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife, and I forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchering without a soul.

Without a soul—save this bright treat
Of heady music, sweet as hell;
And even my peace-abiding feet
Go marching with the marching street,
For yonder goes the fife,
And what care I for human Life;
The tears fill my astonished eyes,
And my full heart is like to break,
And yet it is embannered lies,
A dream those drummers make.

Oh, it is wickedness to clothe
Yon hideous, grinning thing that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the things they loathe;
Art, thou hast many infamies,
But not an infamy like this.

The 'Century Bible' ends this month; this month the 'Oxford Church Bible Commentary' begins. But the two series might have been issued simultaneously. They make their appeal to different students of the Bible. The 'Century Bible' is open to the whole world, the 'Oxford Church Bible Commentary' is open only to those who know Hebrew or Greek.

The title 'The Oxford Church Bible Commentary' is long, but it is there to fulfil its duty. For this is to be a series of commentaries on each of the books of the Bible, and every volume is to be written by some member of the Anglican Church who is connected with the University of Oxford. The general editor for the Old Testament is Dr. C. F. Burney, for the New Testament Mr. Leighton Pullan. The publishers are Messrs. Rivington.

It was a courageous thing to begin with a book of the Apocrypha, but it is a sign of the times. We do not know that the Apocrypha is more read by the people than formerly, or is likely to be more read in the near future; but it is certainly claiming a larger share of the attention of scholars. And this series, as we have said, is addressed to scholars.

There is also an advantage in beginning with the Book of Wisdom, for no good critical edition of that book has appeared since the issue of the *Speaker's Commentary*.

The editor of this new commentary on *The Book of Wisdom* (7s. 6d. net) is the Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick, M.A., Rector of Winterbourne, Bristol, formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford. Mr. Goodrick has had a great opportunity in being ready before the editors of the other books, and he has risen to it. If he is ready first, he has been in no hurry. He has studied the Book of Wisdom thoroughly. He has mastered its literature. He has worked into its life. And he has discovered its many serious problems and found that he could not solve them. What long study, a clear mind, a resolute will, and the free use of Greek letters could do to make this book intelligible has been done. The commentary is a step forward in the study of the Book of Wisdom, perhaps even in the art of commenting.

At the end of the commentary there are six 'Additional Notes,' of which the most momentous is the first. It is a discussion of the late Professor F. C. Porter's views on the psychology of the Book of Wisdom.

Canon J. Howard B. Masterman of Coventry has given his volume of sermons the title of *The Challenge of Christ* (Robert Scott; 3s. 6d. net) because he wishes men to understand that the question which every one of them has to face is the demand that Jesus Christ makes on their lives. He is not uninterested in the problems of theology, but he is resolved that no one who listens to him or reads his book shall escape under the darkness of any theological problem. Our Lord refused to let the Woman of Samaria hide behind the rivalry of Jerusalem and Gerizim as places of worship. And this gentle retention in the light of the one essential thing must be exercised by His servants. Canon Masterman simply brings men into the presence of Christ, and keeps them there till they are ready to surrender to Him body, soul and spirit.

Two things will distinguish this century in the history of the Roman Catholic Church—the rise of the laity and the popularity of retreats. So says Bishop Casartelli in the fresh generous preface which he writes to *Retreats for the People*, by the Rev. Charles Plater, S.J. (Sands; 5s. net). By

retreats, that is popular retreats, retreats to which the people are invited for instruction, is meant pretty nearly that which Protestants call Conventions for the Deepening of the Spiritual Life. The ministerial retreat is become quite a feature of present-day Protestantism, but that is a different thing. For these retreats Mr. Plater claims the credit of a great revival of life and interest in the Church, and he gives reasons to substantiate his claim. The book is written with a sense of exhilaration. Its vigorous style and its numerous photographs will carry it far.

The Rev. W. K. Fleming, M.A., B.D., has done what many men are doing. He has studied the recent books on Mysticism—Inge, Jones, Von Hügel, and the rest—and gained some knowledge of what Mysticism is able to do for us. But he has also done what few men have had the courage to do. He has written a book about Mysticism himself. *Mysticism in Christianity* he calls it (Robert Scott; 5s. net). Covering the ground in the usual way, that is to say, after an introduction, describing the great Christian mystics, or Schools of Mysticism, Mr. Fleming has nothing original to tell us, and does not claim to have. This, however, is his own, his clearness of head, an occasional desideratum both in mystics and mystical writers. What he sees we see. And we remember it.

The Rev. Wilfred M. Hopkins, author of *The Tabernacle and its Teaching*, has written down the thoughts which have come to him while meditating on the Sacrament of Holy Communion, and the book has been published under the title of *Thoughts in His Presence* (Robert Scott; 2s. net). It has been introduced by Canon Barnes-Lawrence, who says that the author's attitude to the Sacrament is 'wholly scriptural, and submits itself to the test of the New Testament.' The thoughts, however, are not in any way controversial, but devotional.

Speakers to men—and in these days speakers to men are many on account of the popularity of the 'Pleasant Sunday Afternoon'—will thank us for calling their attention to a volume of men's addresses which has been published by Mr. Robert Scott, under the title of *The Supreme Service* (1s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Francis R. Wilson. The addresses are well

furnished with telling illustration, and they have a consistency and vigour which the illustration sharpens and sends home.

Free Bondmen is the happy title which Mr. Bernard M. Hancock has given to a small volume of Studies in the Spiritual Life (Robert Scott; 2s. net). The Studies have been used as addresses at various 'Quiet Days' during the past thirteen years. They are accordingly arranged in groups—six addresses on 'the Mother,' four on 'the Son that never did amiss,' three on 'the Prodigal Son,' four on 'the Discoverer' (Andrew), and four on 'the Rock Man.' Every address is both expository and experimental.

There is always some step being made in the understanding of the New Testament, and therefore always room for another introduction. But the *Preliminary Studies on the Books of the New Testament* made by Canon C. R. Ball (Skeffingtons) is more than the latest book on the subject. With all his modest acknowledgment of indebtedness to others, Canon Ball is himself master of the subject, and writes both accurately and with ease. Then he has the gift of style, that incomprehensible but unmistakable gift of drawing the reader into intellectual sympathy, without which no book can be more than moderately successful, or live more than a very short time.

A simple, scriptural, helpful book on Sanctification has been written by the Rev. R. Wood-Samuel, Reader of the Chapel Royal. Its five chapters are the Nature and Necessity of Sanctification, its Demands, its Helps, its Hindrances, and its Completion. The title is *The Narrow Way of Holiness* (S.P.C.K.; 1s.).

The offence of Biblical Criticism has not ceased. But they to whom it is still an offence need not flee to the monuments. If the monuments could have demolished it that service to truth would have been rendered by Professor Sayce. But when Professor Sayce, or any other well-equipped and courageous scholar, comes from the monuments to the destruction of the 'documentary hypothesis,' he comes to curse, and, lo, he blesses altogether.

This experience, however, has not deterred the Rev. Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., LL.D., Lecturer on Biblical Archaeology in Xenia Theological Seminary, from writing another book to show that

there is no concord between the Monuments and the Historical Criticism of the Old Testament. He is no more successful than those who have been before him. And if he had known the Old Testament as well as he knows the Babylonian tablets he would probably have written a book about something else.

But no one need bear him a grudge. There is so much accurate, up-to-date and suggestive material on Biblical archaeology in the book that it deserves a hearty welcome. If the information had been presented less 'apologetically' it would have been more easily accepted, and the book would have had a still heartier and wider welcome. But there it is. Henceforth Dr. Kyle will be known as one of the honourable gild of Assyriologists.

The title of the book is *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net).

'On a time the men of Gottam would have pinned in the cuckoo, whereby shee should sing all the yeere, and in the midst of the town they made a hedge round in compasse, and they had got a cuckoo, and had put her into it, and said, Sing here all the yeere, and thou shalt lacke neither meat nor drinke. The cuckoo as soone as she perceived her selfe incompassed within the hedge flew away. A vengeance on her said they, We made not our hedge high enough.'

This is one of 'The Tales of the Wise Men of Gotham.' The Rev. John Edward Field, M.A., who writes on *The Myth of the Pent Cuckoo* (Elliot Stock; 7s. 6d. net), has nothing further to do with the wise men of Gotham. He is fascinated by that most strange and hitherto inexplicable phenomenon of the South of England, the cuckoo pen. What is it for? To perpetuate the folly of the wise men of Gotham by building walls without a roof to keep the cuckoo here all the year round?

After a long but very pleasant excursion with Mr. Field all over the cuckoo pen country and the literature of the cuckoo, we come at last to the conclusion that the pens have nothing to do with the cuckoo, being human habitations rather, and that the very word 'cuckoo' has nothing to do with the bird of that name, but comes from a verb *to cuck*, which means to utter unintelligible sounds or speak an unknown tongue. And so it is a reminiscence of the time when the earlier inhabi-

tants of that part of England—Britons, Welsh, or whatever you may call them—were looked upon as outlandish by their conquerors the English, and were driven to find shelter in whatever rude hut they could run up, which hut was then called the cuckham or cucksham, and has given its name to many a town or village in that country.

‘Many read and quote the Bible as if the only virtue it inculcated was that of Faith. Few notice how much of its history and precepts is directed to the impressing on us of moral rather than spiritual duties, and how the duties of brotherhood and citizenship are held up to us as a means of serving God in our generation as real as that of worship.’

Canon J. W. Horsley, M.A., has written a large book under the title of *How Criminals are Made and Prevented* (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) for the purpose of impressing this fact upon us. He has, in one chapter, proceeded through the Psalter to make known the wealth of ethical teaching contained in that book of the Bible alone. He has, on the other hand, taken us to the daily and weekly newspapers and shown us how great is the good they could do by means of the virtue (in this case) of omission, and how great is the harm they often do by publishing reports of criminal cases and criminal careers. When Canon Horsley was Chaplain of Clerkenwell Prison, he had under his charge the notorious Charles Peace. He says that the details of that criminal’s career were eagerly read by lads and imitated according to their ability, especially in the matter of secretly carrying weapons about with them. And that custom, he says, has since then grown so greatly that it has been found necessary to furnish our police with revolvers in self-defence.

Thus the value of the book lies in the intimate knowledge which Canon Horsley possesses of the criminal. His illustrations are better than his arguments, though they also are good enough. More might have been made of the illustrating of the book, if it was to be illustrated at all. But that is a small matter. The best thing in it is the earnestness with which Canon Horsley urges the prevention of crime. In that crusade every one of us may take a part, and it is more after the mind of Christ than rescuing the sepulchre from the Saracens.

M. Edouard le Roy contributed two articles to

the *Revue des deux Mondes* in February 1912 on the philosophy of Bergson. Thereafter he republished them, adding notes and additional explanations. Now the volume has been translated into English by Mr. Vincent Benson, M.A., and issued under the title of *A New Philosophy* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net).

Is M. le Roy a competent interpreter of Bergson? This is what Bergson himself says:

‘Underneath and beyond the method you have caught the *intention* and the *spirit*. . . . Your study could not be more conscientious or true to the original. As it advances, condensation increases in a marked degree: the reader becomes aware that the explanation is undergoing a progressive involution similar to the involution by which we determine the *reality of Time*. To produce this feeling, much more has been necessary than a close study of my works: it has required deep sympathy of thought, the power, in fact, of rethinking the subject in a personal and original manner. Nowhere is this sympathy more in evidence than in your concluding pages, where in a few words you point out the possibilities of further developments of the doctrine. In this direction I should myself say exactly what you have said.’

Some lectures by Emile Boutroux have been translated into English. The lectures were delivered at various times, the lecturer tells us, at the Fontenay School, ‘a training college, so to speak, for teachers in elementary schools.’ The ‘able and devoted’ principal of this school is desirous that the students, apart from the regular instruction, should from time to time listen to expositions of subjects that are important in themselves and quite independent of examinations. So Professor Boutroux was invited, and he lectured on a few questions touching education and ethics. The volume is called *Education and Ethics* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net).

Its contents are these: (1) The Principal Types of Ethics, (2) Pessimism, (3) The Motives of Study, (4) Reading Aloud, (5) Interrogation, (6) School and Life. That is a great variety, but the title fairly covers the whole.

The Types of Ethics are three: Hellenic or Esthetic Ethics, Christian or Religious Ethics, and Modern or Scientific Ethics. M. Boutroux shows no partiality for one type over another. He can take the good they all can give.

His one enthusiasm is reading aloud. 'In the human voice there is an indescribable something that is communicated to man, affecting him in the profoundest part of his nature. This corresponds, in a way, to what in physics are called synchronous vibrations. Reader and listeners thrill in unison; the emotion of the former is even strengthened by that of the latter, and *vice versa*. Now, this phenomenon takes place under the influence of the mind whose work is being called forth. It is the author who now lives in them; it is his love of truth and beauty, the secret spring of his thoughts, that enters the soul of his devoted listeners. And so the reader causes the author not merely to be

understood, but also to be loved. At the sound of his voice the written language loses whatever obscure, material element it may possess and becomes a pure symbol; it allows itself to be assimilated in an ever greater degree by souls that seek each other, and ends by becoming nothing less than the connecting link between these souls themselves.

Dann geht die Seelenkraft dir auf,
Wie spricht ein Geist zum andern Geist.

Faust's words are realized. Whilst the whole body thrills, the gates of the soul open wide and spirit communes with spirit.'

The Danger of Mares' Nests in Theology.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

III.

1. In Germany more than in England as yet has the comparative study of religion begun to exercise a potent influence on thought about Christianity; and we may close this discussion with some illustrations of 'mares' nests' from this province of human thought. In this *religious-historical* method now dominant in Germany the first article of faith is that Christianity must be treated as all other religions are. That the documents of this religion must be critically examined and appraised as to their literary character and historical value with all possible candour and impartiality goes without saying. No Christian scholar or thinker can desire to withdraw his faith from scrutiny. But beneath this demand, when we have examined more closely what it often results in, we shall discover that there lurks the assumption that all the religions of the world have the same kind of value and validity, although differences in degree may be admitted. Thus Troeltsch refuses to call Christianity the absolute religion, and maintains that it can only be described as, in comparison with other religions, the highest we can conceive (see the writer's *The Christian Certainty amid the Modern Perplexity*, pp. 52 and 57). The principle of the uniformity of nature is thus raised up into the realm of history as equally authoritative there. Now in the region of history, the sphere of human

personality, liberty, genius, progress, variety, to expect resemblance and to suspect difference is an intellectual solecism. Nature and history differ too much to be approached in the same attitude of mind. Most of all in the history of religion, where, if the religious consciousness is not illusive, man comes into contact with absolute, infinite, ultimate reality, is such an assumption likely to mislead and not to guide aright. We should be prepared to learn what the history may teach, and not approach it with any such prejudice.

In assuming then this religious uniformity, this method seeks by a constant comparison with beliefs, rites, and customs in other religions to discredit the distinctiveness and originality of Christianity. The derivation of Paul's view of the Lord's Supper from the mystery religions of paganism may be mentioned as an illustration of this method, the details of which may be studied in Professor Kennedy's articles in the *Expositor* for 1910. In such comparisons three defects may be detected. *In the first place*, the error of the old dogmatics is repeated; the religions of the world are searched for common features, and these are presented in isolation from their context in the common religious life to which they belong, although in that context they may be seen to have a significance that modifies, if it does not altogether remove,

the apparent resemblance. *Faith* does not mean exactly the same in Habakkuk as it does in Paul's quotation; and even Paul and James do not give the same content to the word. Still more cautious must we be in assigning the same significance to a rite in savage and in civilized, in pagan and in Christian, religion. Similarities are often more apparent than real. *Secondly*, even if elements are found in Christian thought and life that are found in other religions, that does not necessarily mean the moral and spiritual equivalence of Christianity and other religions. What do these elements become in Christianity? Is their value enhanced? Do they convey more divine truth and grace to Christian faith than they elsewhere contain? *Thirdly*, these resemblances are usually in features that are common to it with other faiths, the universal human aspect of all religions; but this does not exclude the reality of other elements, qualitatively higher, which are unshared by other religions,—such as, for instance, the personality of Christ Himself—and the influence of these higher elements, which lift up even what is common to a higher moral and spiritual level. To make so much of resemblances as to give the impression that there are no differences is to palter with the truth.

2. But the method is sometimes pushed farther, and not only resemblance, but even direct dependence, is insisted on. The most notorious example of this extreme is the view of Drews, that no historical Jesus existed, and that the origin of Christianity is to be traced to a Christ-myth, the belief in a dying and reviving God. Regarding such a theory, even were its negation of the historical reality of Jesus proved, as almost all responsible scholars agree it is not, three questions must be pressed. *Firstly*, Did the myth exist at the time when Christianity is supposed to have originated? Of this there is nothing that can be called evidence, only conjecture. *Secondly*, Was the myth known in the circles to which Christianity may be historically traced? The New Testament betrays a Jewish environment, in which such a pagan myth, even if it existed, would not find a congenial soil in which to take root and grow. *Thirdly*, when both questions can be met only with conjecture we must ask, Can Christianity not be explained by the data that the New Testament presents to us? If it can, it is only the vagary of pretended scholarship to ignore the explanation

that lies at hand, and to go on a wild-goose chase after another.

CONCLUSION.

1. As these instances, it is hoped, have shown, the study of Christian theology is beset by many perils at the present moment. All sorts of plausible theories to explain it, or more often to explain it away, are in circulation, and are eagerly welcomed by the unstable minds that are only too common even among professed Christian teachers. What can save us from these dangers? What can protect us from making fools of ourselves in the discovery of mares' nests? There seem to be these safeguards. *Firstly*, we should discipline our minds in accuracy of knowledge and exactness of thought in any realm in which we may be seeking assistance in the interpretation of the Christian faith. Such a discipline of mind as will preserve our sanity of judgment must be our aim. *Secondly*, we should suspect new theories that display too marvellous ingenuity in the combination of their data, and betray the ambition in their authors to be startlingly original. *Thirdly*, we should treat with the respect that it deserves the great mass of reverent, serious, and responsible Christian scholarship that has an unbroken tradition within the Christian Church. There are advances in knowledge and in thought, but not violent breaches with the mental inheritance. Yet there are many persons to-day who eagerly snatch up new views, and are content to be ignorant of the growth of Christian truth within the Church. *Lastly*, our own Christian experience is the witness in ourselves of what Christ is and does, by which we must test any theory of what kind it is.

2. By this is not meant a pragmatism which seeks to be relieved of the labour of thought, and wants a short cut to truth. We do want a *philosophy*; but it must be a philosophy that leaves room for all the moral and religious facts—sin and redemption, man's need and God's grace. The *personalism* to which reference has already been made seems alone adequate to Christian experience. We do want to use *psychology* as much as possible to bring our religious consciousness to clearest and fullest self-consciousness; only we must be constantly on our guard against inadequate categories of thought, which do not represent, but misrepresent, the reality with which we are concerned. We do want to pursue the *comparative study of*

religion; for it has much to teach us both as to the solidarity of mankind in religious necessity and aspiration, and also as to the distinctiveness of Christianity as the only adequate satisfaction of the soul of man. Let our mind be a well-ordered inn, where many guests of reputable character are

welcomed and entertained; but let it not sink to be a casual ward, where the vagrants can seek shelter. ‘Quench not the spirit; despise not prophesying; prove all things; hold fast that which is good; abstain from every appearance of evil.’

In the Study.

Cura Curarum.

BY THE REV. A. F. TAYLOR, M.A., ST. CYRUS.

‘THE heart that tries to sustain itself upon human commendation will discover with bitterness that the demand will ever increase. There is no more certain cause of depression than the accepting of lower satisfactions.’—A. W. ROBINSON, *Personal Life of Clergy*.

‘On one occasion when I was going to preach a Lent course in Paris, Francis was bidding me pay little heed to the world’s opinion, and he illustrated his advice by the following anecdote. The Superior of a convent committed the charge of the convent clock to a certain old man who wanted something to occupy him. But ere long he complained that he had never been given a more troublesome or vexatious charge. “What! winding up the weights twice a day?” exclaimed the Superior in amazement. “Oh no! it is not that; it is that I am so worried on all sides. If the clock is a few minutes slow, the students from within are down upon me; and then if to please them I put it on a few minutes, the other students grumble and say our time is fast. Perhaps I put it back to silence their complaints, and the others begin again, till my poor head might as well be the clapper of the bell itself—I am so bothered with the whole thing.”

‘The Superior comforted the poor old man by telling him to give kind words to all, but meanwhile to let the clock be and not try to adapt its time to one or two.

“Now you will be exposed to all manner of criticisms,” Francis went on to say, “and if you trouble yourself as to what is said to you, there will be no end of it. Your course must be to be courteous to everybody; but meanwhile go your own way, be rational, do not try to follow all the

contradictory advice you are certain to receive, fix your mind on God, and follow the leading of His grace. We ought to care little for men’s judgment, since our object is not to please them; He sees into the most hidden corners of our hearts.”—BISHOP OF BELLEY.

‘When you have been preaching, beware of the empty applause poured out upon you. What eloquence! What learning! Such a memory! Such grace! It is delightful to listen!—and the like, all this empty chatter coming forth from empty brains. So Jerome says that the Christian preacher should not cultivate the artifices of rhetoric, but content himself with the simplicity of fishermen, *i.e.* the Apostles; and if St. Paul condemns *listeners* who have itching ears, how much more does he condemn those *preachers* whose aim is to tickle such ears with fanciful words, choice illustrations, and artistic combinations. But if after a sermon you find a few hearers who cry out with the centurion, Truly this is the Son of God! who have learned to know Christ crucified, and who say of the preacher, It will not be his fault if we do not turn from our evil ways,—this sermon will rise up against us in the last judgment if we do not make good use of the warning. If they have learned the needfulness of penitence, the blessing of holiness, or if their lives give token that the lesson has sunk deep into their hearts, then indeed you may pronounce the preacher to be excellent and able to promote not his own glory but God’s, who gives His Holy Spirit to His servant and speaks through him.’—ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

‘A large part of what is called sensational preaching is simply the effort of a man who has no faith in his office or in the essential power of truth to keep himself before people’s eyes by some kind of

intellectual fantasticalness. It is a pursuit of brightness and vivacity of thought for its own sake which seems to come from a certain almost desperate determination of the sensational minister that he will not be forgotten.'—PHILLIPS BROOKS.

'Let a man be a true preacher, really uttering the truth through his own personality, and it is strange how men will gather to listen to him.'—PHILLIPS BROOKS.

'It is not our own honour but God's that we seek, and meanwhile He will take care of ours.'—ST. FRANCIS DE SALES.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Parable of the Clock.

BY THE REV. FREDERICK J. RAE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

A PARABLE is an earthly story, or an earthly object, with a heavenly meaning. Now one of the commonest objects among us is a clock. We see it every day. We look at it often in a day. It has a story to tell, and is always telling it, quietly, steadily, without haste and without rest. It is the heavenly meaning of this story I am going to tell you to-day. It was told to me by one to whom it had brought much comfort.

The face of the clock is our life. The hands are God's hands, passing over our life continually, day by day, without any pause. God's hands are never removed from us. He is always acting in our life in one way or another. And the two hands of the clock tell us of the two different ways in which He acts. The short hand is the hand of Discipline. Slowly and surely it passes over our life. Not one of us, not even children, can escape it. Even children have their troubles, their disappointments, their sorrows, often as real and severe to them as the sorrows of grown-up people are to *them*. Nor should we wish to escape this hand of God, because it always brings us blessing. There is nothing God does to us that does not bring blessing.

The long hand of the clock is the hand of Mercy. And you know that the long hand passes over the dial of the clock far oftener than the short hand. I think this also is true of what God does to us. The hand of His mercy brings us happiness and prosperity and kindness, and these things come to

us far oftener than trouble. Happiness is far oftener with us than sorrow. Health is far oftener ours than illness. Food and plenty come to people far oftener than want and famine. The things that are hard come to every one of us, but not often. The things that gladden us and help us and make us healthy and strong come to us every day.

But there is one thing more about these hands. They both move together. They are both fastened to one pivot. They are both controlled by one power, and move at the same time and never separately. Do you see the beautiful heavenly meaning of this? *All* that God does comes from His love. His hand of discipline and His hand of mercy are both moved by His heart of love. And so all our troubles and all our joys are given by His love, and it is the same heart that sends both. Will you think of all this sometimes as you look at the clock in your home?

May.

BY THE REV. ROBERT HARVIE, M.A., EARLSTON.

'Grow in grace.'—2 P 3¹⁸.

To-day I want to say something about the month of May.

Its name means 'the growing month,' and we certainly can hardly fail, at this time, to take note of the growth upon the trees and in the fields.

It is not so much done now, but there used to be a great many old customs kept up on the first day of the month.

A good many years ago, I remember (when I was the age of some of you) that on the first of May we rose very early and went into a public park to get the dew. The notion we had was that if you rubbed your cheeks in the dew they would be fresh and rosy all through the summer.

It was the habit, too, of some, to go out early on that morning into the woods and to come back with flowers. With these they decorated their homes. That was called 'bringing home the May.'

Some years ago I enjoyed taking part in a ceremony which was called 'Welcoming the summer.' It was in a town in Germany of which a good part was built on the slopes of a hill, with a famous old castle at the top, and a river flowing round the foot of it. About midnight on the 30th April, most of the students assembled at the castle with lanterns, and each stood with his lantern

hanging over the castle wall. But some others were sent out to command several hills round about the town, and on the top they formed a square which we saw by their lanterns. At midnight—just as May was coming in—the castle bell began to ring. Rockets were fired, and we all joined in singing a song of welcome for summer.

In some places the gladness of the season was celebrated by choosing a young girl who was crowned with flowers and called 'The Queen of May.'

I want to suggest to you a way in which every girl might be crowned a queen, and how boys and girls alike might help 'to bring home the May.'

Have you heard the story of Gwen? I often think of her. She was a young girl who lived with her old father out in the plains of Canada. She was quite fearless and rode her own pony. She drove the wild cattle and was greatly admired for her daring spirit by all the people who lived near. But one day she fell over a cliff. She had been driving the cattle and they pressed her too near the edge, and when she came to a sharp turning, her pony didn't come round quickly enough, so both it and Gwen fell over the precipice. Her friends discovered the pony so seriously hurt that it had to be shot. Gwen was lying under it and was very badly crushed. She had to be carried home, and was so much bruised that there was no way of hastening on recovery except to lie in bed and be patient, for months at least. You know how hard it is to remain indoors when all outside seems to be calling you,—the sun shining and making everything look its best—the birds singing early in the morning—and your friends delighting in their sports. Well, Gwen loved the open air and just *hated* to remain indoors, but there was nothing else for it. She was patient for a while, until one day she overheard the doctor telling some one that she would never walk again. She was nearly mad with rage. She said she had always done as she liked and she would do so still. She was angry with God because He had allowed her to fall. She had once said she did not care for God, and she thought He had taken a cruel revenge. But you know He is not like that. He is 'Our Father in heaven.' To many of us He gives proof of His love in the round of happiness He sends us, but often we take what

He gives and forget Himself. Then sometimes He blesses us (yes, *blesses us*) in suffering. We feel we need Him then. God does not take pleasure in our pains, but He wants us for Himself and He takes this way with us

Because He cannot choose a softer way
To make us feel that He Himself is near
And each apart His own Beloved and known.

That way of God's worked well with Gwen. At first she was impatient and rebellious and wilful. It was painful for her friends (and she had many) to be near her when she lost her self-control and gave way to violent bursts of temper. She used to cry, 'Oh, I am sick of all this, I want to ride. I want to see all the things outside.' In these days she didn't think God cared at all.

But a good friend of hers let her see it in the right way. He told her about Jesus being God's Son—His Beloved—and yet how *His* life had so much sorrow. He was spitefully treated. He was despised by enemies and deserted by friends. It seemed at the end as if God Himself had forgotten Him. Yet the Father gave to the Son only what was best. Because of all He suffered, Jesus is Himself crowned with glory and honour, and He is full of love and sympathy for all who suffer.

Gwen began to see that it *must* be true for Jesus—God's own Son,—and it *might* be true for her also—she would try. That began a great change for Gwen. She put off her old angry, bitter ways, and after much striving (and many prayers for help) she became patient and self-controlled and gentle. Her room was the brightest place in all the district.

Now the violet speaks to us of *modesty* or *humility*, the lily of *purity*, the snowdrop of *courage*, the chrysanthemum of *kindness*. These are the graces which we see in Christ. After many struggles Gwen was crowned with these fair flowers of character. One day her great friend said of her, 'Of all the flowers I have seen, none are fairer or sweeter than those that are waving in Gwen's canyon.' The canyon was the place where she lived. If, therefore, we practise all the beautiful habits we see in Christ's life, in the place where we live, some will say that we are growing in grace, but others will say we have been 'bringing home the May.'

What were the Churches of Galatia?

BY SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, LL.D., D.D., D.C.L., EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HUMANITY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN.

VII.

XII. THE NAMES OF THE PROVINCE GALATIA.—There are two types of designation for this province during the first century: one type was produced by the unifying and centralizing tendency of the Imperial governor, the other by the separatist and isolating and centrifugal tendency which manifested itself at an early date and slowly broke up the Empire. These two ways of naming the province require careful attention. One is used most frequently in Latin, the other in Greek (though in neither case exclusively): one is usual in the west and in Ancyra, the capital of the province, the other is the prevailing fashion through most of Asia Minor: one may fairly be called the Roman custom, the other is the Graeco-Oriental. The former type is shown in two designations, 'Galatia' and 'Galatic Eparchia' (the latter being the Greek form corresponding to a possible Latin form *provincia Galatia*, which is not known in actual use).¹ The second type appears in a number of slight varieties enumerating more or less fully the parts or 'regions' of which the province was composed.

Among the examples analogous to the names Galatia and Galatica Eparchia, one may be quoted. Aquitania or Gallia Aquitanica lay between Garonne and Pyrenees. In 27 B.C. fourteen tribes north of Garonne were added, and the enlarged province Gallia Aquitanica was formed (Pliny, iv. 19, 108), called in inscriptions 'provincia Aquitanica' (so also Pliny, xxvi. 4), or 'Aquitania' simply (Tacitus, *Hist.* i. 76, etc.; Sueton. *Galb.* 6; and inscriptions, e.g. *C.I.L.* xiv. 2925, etc.). This is an exact parallel to the use of 'Galatic Eparchia' and 'Galatia' simply. The people of Aquitanica *provincia*, whether non-Aquitanian Celts or non-Celtic Aquitanians (who spoke a totally different language, probably of Basque or Iberian type), were summed up as 'Aquitani'; and even 'Aquitani Bituriges' occurs, though the Bituriges were a purely Celtic people, distinguished from the Aquitani by Strabo, p. 191, but incorporated in Aquitanica

in 27 B.C. by Augustus. Just as the non-Aquitanian Celts of the province Aquitania were summed up by the Romans as Aquitani, so the non-Galatian peoples of the province Galatia were known collectively to the Romans as Galatae.

1. The Western Type.—(1) As to the name which was applied in St. Paul's time to the great central province of Asia Minor by the people and the government of the southern cities, Iconium, Apollonia, Antioch, etc., there is known as yet only one epigraphic proof in an inscription of Iconium (*C.I.G.* 3991), of 54 A.D., where the province is called *Γαλατικὴ ἐπαρχεία*.² Brandis on Galatia (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, p. 555) objects that this inscription is dedicated to a Procurator, and that procuratorial provinces sometimes varied in boundaries and extent from the provinces governed by legati or by proconsuls.³ But the objection is not pertinent, for the question is not regarding extent and limits, but whether the Iconians would or would not call the province to which they belonged by the name 'Galatic.' Evidently the city of Iconium officially used the term 'Galatic' at the time when St. Paul was travelling there, to designate its provincial relationship: it reckoned itself to be included in the southern extension of the province Galatia. Similarly Luke reckons Iconium as included in the Galatic region, otherwise called Phrygia.

(2) The name ordinarily used by the Romans for this province was simply Galatia. Ptolemy

² In such a matter the official usage is proved by one example quite as conclusively as by ten.

³ He neglects the inscription of south-western Phrygia Galatica, in which the procurator of *C.I.G.* 3991 acts along with the governor of the province Galatia (*Amer. Journ. Arch.* ii. p. 128; *O.G.I.S.* No. 538). He also says that *Γαλατικῆς ἐπαρχείας* is markedly divergent from ordinary usage, *procurator Galatia* if Galatia was the recognized name. The learned author ought to add that the correct formula is *procurator provinciae* followed by the name *Asiae*, etc., and that it is an abbreviated title when *provincia* is omitted: also that *ἐπαρχείας* is only the translation of *provinciae*. The important fact is that Iconium officially as a city called itself part of the 'Galatic' province.

¹ Naturally there are not many references to this province in the literature and epigraphy of the West.

gives a chapter to each Roman province of Asia Minor: i. Bithynia-Pontus; ii. Asia; iii. Lycia; iv. Galatia (including as parts of it the regions Paphlagonia, tribal Galatia, Lycania, Pisidia, Isauria), v. Pamphylia,¹ vi. Cappadocia. Pliny, v. 146, enumerates under his term Galatia² cities of Paphlagonia, Pontus Galaticus, tribal Galatia, Lycania, Pisidia, Pisidian Phrygia. Stephanus Byz. says that Karana was a city of Galatia: now Karana was in Pontus Galaticus. These are three leading geographical authorities. Tacitus (*Hist.* ii. 9; *Ann.* xiii. 35) calls this province Galatia; and so do the late historians (who took the name from older authorities) Syncellus, i. p. 592; Eutropius, vii. 10; *Scr. Hist. Aug.* xxi. 7. 2, xxiv. 18. 8. Professor E. Schürer formerly maintained that the single name Galatia was never used so as to include the southern part of the large province, and that it always meant simply the original Galatia of the three Gaulish tribes in the north; but when his attention was called to the passages of Ptolemy, Pliny, etc., he withdrew from this position, and admitted that the term Galatia was

¹ He gives Lycia and Pamphylia separately; they were strictly two provinces under one governor (as were Galatia and Cappadocia for a considerable time; and later also the Three Eparchies), not like Bithynia-Pontus, Asia, etc. There were a Lykiarch and a Pamphyliarch, separate from each other.

² Pliny sometimes confuses the two senses of Galatia because he used authorities who employed it, some in one, some in the other sense (cf. vi.).

used sometimes for the entire Roman province, viz. large parts of Pisidia, Galatia, Lycania, Isauria, with Paphlagonia and two regions of Pontus. As his first article in *Zft. f. Protestant. Theologie*, xii., was a long and ambitious one, it is still sometimes quoted as representing his final opinion; and therefore I give the reference to his brief withdrawal, *Theolog. Wochenschrift*, 30th Sept. 1893, p. 507.

Needless to say, the fact that his first reasons could not be maintained made no difference to his opinion: he continued as staunch to the North-Galatian theory as ever. In my first reply to him in *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 180*, p. 34, I quoted only one epigraphic proof, as this appeared to be conclusive (though inadvertently the plural 'inscriptions' was allowed to remain in a correction of text). I will therefore state now the epigraphic evidence at greater length, though not with any attempt at systematic completeness.

The name Galatia simply is used in inscriptions to designate the Roman province as a whole: I have not tried to make a full collection, but quote *C.I.L.* iii. 251, 254, 272 (*Eph. Ep.* v. 51), 6753, vi. 332, 1408, 1409, 1644 add p. 854, viii. 11028 (Mommsen rightly, but not Schmidt), 18270, x. 7583, 7584 (also Allmer-Dissard *Inscr. de Lyon*, i. p. 185, as is quoted, though I have not access to the book, and the inscription may not give any evidence). Some of these need further elucidation.

Contributions and Comments.

Professor Nestle.

THE death of Dr. Eberhard Nestle, of Maulbronn, will probably come as a surprise to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, to which he has long been a constant and valued contributor. He underwent two serious operations at Stuttgart a few months ago, which were reported to be successful as far as surgical skill could go; and his friends hoped that a further span of life and usefulness would be granted to him; but his remains are to be laid in the earth to-day at Maulbronn, at the age of 61.

Others can tell better than I of Dr. Nestle's vast store of learning, and his solid contributions to the sacred literature of our day, affecting our

understanding of both Testaments. His most enduring monument will be the Greek text of the New Testament, compiled at first for the Wurtemberg Bible Society, and afterwards adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Such an achievement by one single scholar is a proof that his sound learning and cautious judgment were appreciated both by his own countrymen and ours. Dr. Nestle spent part of his life as a Professor, but he was perhaps too erudite for the work required of him; and he was transferred from Ulm to Maulbronn, where he had the charge of lecturing to youths who were preparing for the ministry. His duties there gave him ample time for the editing of Holy Scripture.

Those who, like my sister and I, have been privileged to visit this great scholar in his beautiful home (an old monastery) at Maulbronn, will not soon forget the charm of his family life. Besides a son by a former marriage, Dr. and Mrs. Nestle had five girls and a boy. It was sweet to see them all gathered round the breakfast table; and what I especially admired was the way in which they said grace. First the father offered up a petition, then Mrs. Nestle another, then his son Erwin, then each of the girls in turn according to their age; not one was left out, even a tiny voice being heard at the close from the mother's knee.

I conclude with the postscript of a letter, written to Mrs. Lewis by Dr. Rendel Harris, on October 7th of last year, in which he says: 'Nestle is a brother beloved to us and quite one of the bright and steady lights in the learned world. . . . When I think of him, I feel inclined to say, 'We have no man like-minded (*ἰσόψυχον*), so simple and so earnest and so loyal to truth and to friends. The Lord bless him!'

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

St. Paul's Handwriting.

My own experience is quite in line with that of Mr. Lowther Clarke (February issue, p. 285) as regards the handwriting of labouring men. It is by no means the rule that they write a large hand: often it is small and crabbed. And does the term 'large' (Gal 6¹¹) necessarily imply that the characters as written by Paul were 'clumsy' and 'awkward'—the terms into which Deissmann expands the description?

A quite natural and simple explanation of the use of large characters in the autograph close of the Epistle is that suggested by Theodore of Mopsuestia long ago (as quoted by Lightfoot), namely, that the Apostle so wrote to give emphasis to what he had to say, a matter on which he was so tremendously in earnest and which he was prepared to maintain in the face of all the world. If we are to go beyond this, would there not be as much to be said in favour of the old and widespread view which explains the large writing as due to eye-weakness and bad sight? Deissmann appears to pass this over as not worthy of notice. But, to refer again to experience, I recall the handwriting of a clergyman which was unusually large. It was unmistakably the writing of an educated man, but its

largeness was explained by the writer's very defective sight.

Deissmann is very eager in his contention that St. Paul simply belonged to 'the artisan non-literary classes and that he remained with them' (*St. Paul*, Eng. tr., p. 50), and his treatment of the subject is, of course, characteristically bright and interesting. It is a view which *per se* might very well be welcomed. But he evidently finds himself in difficulties in making all the facts of the case square with this position. How to keep his illustrious artisan purely an artisan and 'non-literary,' or how to account for the whole Paul of the Acts and the Epistles on these lines, becomes a too formidable problem on p. 53. We are left to content ourselves with the author's somewhat vague claim that he has 'drawn a relatively certain line by placing St. Paul below the literary upper class and above the purely proletarian lowest classes.'

J. S. CLEMENS.

Ranmoor College, Sheffield.

The Spirit of Jesus.

I HAVE lately been studying the 'Acts of the Apostles' under that view of the work which was the obvious view of the author Luke, namely, that it is a continuation or sequel to the work which while on earth Jesus 'began to do and to teach' (Ac 1¹), and that its aim is to show, not the acts or doings of the apostles themselves, but how 'the Spirit of Jesus' (Ac 16⁷ R.V.) guided the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, and did so in spite of the obvious desire of Peter to graft the new shoot on to the old stem of Judaism. As I thus studied the Acts, and particularly the conduct of Peter in resisting 'the Spirit' whose voice he had clearly heard (Ac 10¹⁹), and, at least in that instance, obeyed, it dawned upon me that here was a master-key to the words of Jesus to Peter in Jn 21¹⁵⁻¹⁹. Jesus tries to impress upon him that, if he loves Him, he must feed not only part of the flock, not only the lambs, but also the sheep. If he will not do so of himself and out of love, he will be forced to do so (v.¹⁸). At the close are the significant words, 'Follow me.' Did not Jesus foresee that Peter would still follow his own impulsive will, and that that might lead him to feed only that part of the flock which it pleased him to feed?

ROBERT E. LEE.

Manse of Dunn.

Mark ix. 23.

THE father's entreaty, 'If thou canst do anything, have compassion on us, and help us,' undoubtedly suggests that in his mind there is some fear of a limitation in our Lord's powers, as if He might not be able to effect a complete cure. When, then, our Lord replies, 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth,' is He throwing back the suggestion of ineffectiveness on the father? 'If there is any limit, it is in thyself: all things are possible to him that believeth.' It is so that the words are usually taken, as a challenge to the father to stir himself up to a greater, and therefore more effective, faith.

The immediately following context seems strongly to support this interpretation. The father's reply indicates that he so understood our Lord. The latter part of his reply may indeed be open to some difference of interpretation; but the drift of the whole is plainly that he is struggling to attain the position in which the blessing may be his, or to maintain his footing there. 'All things possible to him that believeth! Lord, I believe. Help me against my unbelief, or even against it.' The words seem to have no relevance unless he understood our Lord to mean that it was on his faith that the miracle depended.

And, of course, this interpretation finds further support in the fact that our Lord's miracles of healing are generally represented as depending on the faith of the patient, or at least of the suppliant. 'According to your faith be it done unto you' (Mt 9²⁹) and 'He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief' (Mt 13⁵⁸) are two typical statements, which, positively and negatively, illustrate this rule of our Lord's working.

Considerations such as these are perhaps sufficient to explain the fact that our Lord's words are usually taken to be, as I have said, a challenge to the father's faith. Another view is, however, at least possible,—that our Lord is not directly challenging the father to the exercise of a greater faith, but is with calm dignity repelling the suggestion that in Himself there is any limitation of power, and asserting his competency to the granting in full of the father's prayer. 'If thou canst! Why such words to me? With me it is no matter of being able to do more or less: all things are possible to him that believeth.' This inter-

pretation is possible: Its probability depends on such considerations as these.

1. Only so interpreted do our Lord's words seem perfectly relevant to the father's petition. The father had said, 'If thou canst do anything,' and our Lord's reply, 'If thou canst! All things are possible to him that believeth,' is most directly relevant if under the law of supernatural power thus generally stated, He is subsuming not the father, but Himself, 'Why that "if thou canst" to me? Do you not know that to (me as) a believing man all things are possible?' For τὸ before εἰ δύει implies that our Lord is not retorting ('Nay; it is rather if thou canst'), but has caught up from the father's petition, and is repeating the words which implied doubt of His powers; and if that is so, the phrase following as a reply to the doubt must surely also refer to Himself. Its very generality favours this view: a retort would require to be more pointed. If to a hesitating appeal from an accidentally injured man we heard the reply given, 'Help you! That is not difficult for a doctor,' would we not conclude that the speaker was himself a doctor?

2. This seems, then, the less forced interpretation if we follow the R.V. The A.V., with its insertion of 'believe' after 'If thou canst,' made it necessary to take the words as reflected back on the father. But the very insertion is an argument against this interpretation, in so far as it indicates that without it (*i.e.* according to the true text) this reflected turn of the words was felt to be somewhat forced. Of course it might be argued, on the other hand, that the insertion, if it were made to render easier this reflected interpretation, thereby proves at least that this interpretation was already widely current. However that may be, there may be found sufficient reasons for the currency of this interpretation other than its truth,—a literary reason in the lack of imagination able to interpret Mark's graphic language; and a theological reason, more potent perhaps than the other, in a reluctance to regard our Lord under the aspect of a believing man, and a tendency to ascribe His miracles directly to powers inherent in His divine nature.

3. That miracles depend on the faith of the agent, if not solely at least conjointly with that of the patient, is certain; and it does not in any way derogate from our Lord to bring His works under this general rule. Must we not do so if we are in

earnest with our belief in His humanity? Does not He Himself take this position? Consider His words at the grave of Lazarus, 'Father, I thank thee that thou hearest me' (Jn 11⁴¹⁻⁴²). So also we may interpret the dependent correspondence of the works of the Son with the works of the Father (Jn 5¹⁹).

4. One may note, too (though perhaps, owing to the lack of detail in our records, not much weight need be attached to this consideration), that while the faith of the patient or suppliant is generally made a condition of our Lord's miracles of healing, there are, so far as the record goes, one or two exceptions, and that these are cases of demoniacal possession (Mt 8³¹, Mk 1^{24, 25}).

5. When the disciples ask our Lord, 'Why could not we cast it out?' the reply is not, 'Because of the weakness of the father's faith,' nor is any reference made to him at all. It is uncompromisingly stated, 'Because of your little faith': from which this would seem to be a fair inference, —if the disciples failed because of their little faith, our Lord succeeded because of His perfect faith: this it was that made possible the expulsion of the demon. Mark's 'All things are possible to him that believeth,' and Matthew's 'Nothing shall be impossible to you,' are obviously parallel; and as the latter has reference to the disciples as working miracles, the former should be taken in a similar way, as referring to Him who was to work, rather than to him who was to receive, the miraculous boon.

6. What seems difficult on this interpretation of our Lord's words as referring to Himself is the apparent irrelevancy of the father's reply to them. But on the other interpretation there is an irrelevancy in our Lord's answer to the father (v. § 1), and a still greater irrelevancy in His answer to His disciples (v. § 5). Further, besides this setting off irrelevancy on the one view against irrelevancy on the other, is not the apparent irrelevancy of the father's reply more easy of solution? Our Lord's reply to the disciples is part of a deliberate unhurried conversation: there no emotional disturbance need be taken into account. But in the case of the father's reply to our Lord it is very different. What earnestness, what agony of love was there! How easy for him to misunderstand the bearing of our Lord's words, to take them as a challenge to exercise a greater faith rather than as a call to confide in the faith of

our Lord: a misunderstanding all the more natural, if, as has been suggested,¹ our Lord's faith, so majestic, so unperturbed by all the gravity of the case, was already, as is natural to every *πληροφορία πίστεως* (1 Th 1⁵), in some measure drawing out the father's love to an attitude of trust. May not his words be best taken, not as a logically relevant answer, but as a confused cry evoked by the vision of our Lord's faith and the birth throes of his own? P. J. MACLAGAN.

Acts xv. 3 and the Early Date of 'Galatians.'

In an article in a recent number of *The Expositor*, Sir W. M. Ramsay acknowledges his conversion to the theory that 'Galatians' was written before the Apostolic Council. This theory had already been strongly advocated by Professor Valentin Weber, Mr. Douglass Round, and Professor Vernon Bartlet, but had not commended itself to the majority of scholars. Its adoption, however, by Professor K. Lake and the conversion of Professor Ramsay in the same direction, render it a question of serious import in the domain of N.T. criticism. Ramsay dates the letter from Antioch itself, while Lake places it a few weeks later, on the way up from Antioch to Jerusalem. The general arguments against the theory are unusually strong and weighty; but there is one consideration, based on Ac 15³, which appears to me to decide conclusively against it, if we attach any value at all to Acts as a historical document. I will state the problem as briefly as possible.

St. Luke in Ac 15³, describing the progress of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, tells us that 'they passed through both Phoenicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren.' There can be no possible doubt that St. Luke when he speaks of 'the conversion of the Gentiles' is referring to the recent evangelization of the cities of S. Galatia which, in his mind as well as that of St. Paul, was an epoch-making step of the most momentous importance. Now

¹ 'The faith of Jesus has inspired him also with faith. He is on the side of God now, and against the demon, and believes that good is to conquer evil' (Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, in loc.)

let us consider the significance of the proposed date of the letter when faced with this statement of St. Luke's. Paul and Barnabas had, less than six months before, returned from a missionary tour which had been attended by unqualified success, and had resulted in Christianity being apparently firmly planted in the cities of the southern district of the Galatian province. Meanwhile, according to this theory, a counter movement in the shape of a Judaistic and Anti-Pauline mission had been set on foot in this identical district, and the second movement seems to have been no less successful than the original mission of the Apostles; for, within the space of three or four months at the most, the Galatians were almost entirely weaned from the gospel preached by St. Paul, and were prepared to accept the yoke of Judaism and to repudiate the authority of the Apostle. News of this defection reached him at Antioch, and, either just before he started for Jerusalem or while on the journey itself, he wrote to his erstwhile converts the Epistle to the Galatians, with its sustained severity, its indignant remonstrances, in which every line is charged with intense emotion. The momentous gravity of the situation in Galatia, which meant nothing less than the entire shipwreck of the Apostle's dearest hopes, the ruin of his spiritual children, as well as the warmth of the Apostle's indignation and the intensity of his disappointment, are manifest on the very surface of the Epistle. And yet St. Luke has not a word to say of all this, although the Judaistic controversy is the one question which engrosses his attention in this section of the Acts. The importance with which he invests the mission to S. Galatia has already been noted, and yet he passes over this paralyzing crisis in complete silence. Nay, more. Far from realizing that there was any crisis at all, he describes St. Paul proceeding joyfully up to Jerusalem, relating to every Christian community that he meets on his way the wonderful progress of the gospel of Christ in Galatia, filling the hearts of brethren in the cities of Phoenicia and Samaria with joy because of the rich promise of Gentile Christianity. And this at the very time when, according to this theory, information had just been received concerning these very Gentile Churches which filled his heart with despair lest the whole of his work among them should be irreparably destroyed. If the Epistle to the Galatians was written at this period, then St. Luke

must have entirely misconceived the situation, and he ceases to have any claim on our respect as a serious historian.

MAURICE JONES.

Gosport.

The Stone Rolled Away.

I.

MR. WEIR, in his letter about 'the stone rolled away,' has paid more attention to the Syriac than to the Greek of Lk 24³⁴. If he will just look at this verse again, he will see at once that the word translated 'saying' is *λέγοντας*, that is, the accusative, and that consequently it was not the comers from Emmaus who told the eleven disciples that 'the Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon,' but just the reverse; it was the eleven disciples who gave this information to the newcomers. This agrees with St. Paul's affirmation in 1 Co 15⁵. Consequently, Mr. Weir's supposition of St. Paul's having made a mistake falls to the ground. The Syriac translation in Lk 24³⁴ is just as ambiguous as the English, but the Greek is quite clear.

May I quote the solution given by Isho'dad in the ninth century, quoting, as he usually does, Theodore of Mopsuestia (fourth century)? It is to the effect that the Corinthians to whom Paul was writing would not have accepted the evidence of women, and therefore this chivalrous Apostle forbears to mention them, in order not to expose them to possible ridicule. He asks also, 'How could the Apostle, who forbids women to speak in the church, support the main proof of the truth of Christianity on their testimony? Therefore he gives the chief place of honour to Simeon.'

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

II.

I wish to add a word to Mrs. Gibson's communication about the 'stone rolled away.' I cannot think that Mr. Weir's view of Lk 24² is the correct one, because surely Luke must be interpreted by Mark. The Syriac language has two genders only, the masculine and the feminine; the feminine doing duty for the neuter. It is well known that *نَوْد*, 'a stone' (rather than a rock), is feminine. But St. Peter cannot, in Syriac, be mistaken for a stone; because, where he is furnished

with a verb or a relative pronoun, these are always in the masculine; whereas, when a stone is meant, these adjuncts are feminine; just as in French, we say, 'cette pierre a été roulée,' but in the case of a boy, 'ce Pierre est méchant.' Apply this simple rule to the text of the Gospel, and what result do you get?

As Mr. Weir observes, Luke has omitted to state, in chap. 23, that a stone had been put on the grave; and there is no indication of a gender about οντα in Lk 24²; except that the Cureton MS. inserts the feminine pronoun η, 'she.' We may thus translate the passage into French, 'Et elles trouvèrent la pierre, celle qui a été roulée du sepulcre.' The Sinai MS. and the Peshitta Version omit the pronoun which corresponds to 'celle.'

In Mk 16³ (Sinai text, 16⁴) there is no doubt whatever, because we have the statement, 'for it was very great,' and 'was' is decidedly feminine. We cannot use this touchstone in English, for our language has none of these grammatical niceties. The feminine, as I have said, does duty for the neuter; and in the case of a phrase being nomina-

tive to a verb, that verb, and any relative pronoun which represents the phrase, would be feminine.

Let us look then at the important passage in Mt 16¹⁸. Before the Sinai MS. was turned into a palimpsest, *i.e.* before 778 A.D., it unfortunately lost the leaf which must have contained this verse. But the Old Syriac Version is represented by the Cureton MS., and it, along with the Peshitta, the Authorized Version of the Syriac Church, leaves us in no manner of doubt. Their testimony must be given in French.

Mt 16¹⁸, 'Et moi je te dis aussi que tu es le Pierre, et sur cette pierre je bâtirai mon Église.' These two ancient versions agree word for word, in this saying of our Lord. It is evident that Peter's confession, not Peter himself, is grammatically represented by 'cette pierre,' and that the Syriac Versions simply and strongly support the view held of this verse by the ancient Orthodox Church of the East, and also by the Reformed Churches of the West.

AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

Cambridge.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. W. M. Czamanske, Sheboygan, Wisconsin.

Illustrations of the Great Text for June must be received by the 1st of May. The text is 1 Co 6^{19, 20}.

The Great Text for July is Jn 3⁸—'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' A copy of Royce's *The Sources of Religious Insight*, or of Bliss's *The Religions of Modern Syria and Palestine*, or of any two volumes of the 'Short Course' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for August is Ps 31¹⁵—'My times are in thy hand.' A copy of Thorburn's *Jesus the Christ*, or any volume of 'The Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is Ac 11²⁴—

'For he was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith.' A copy of Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for October is Lk 14¹⁸—'And they all with one consent began to make excuse.' A copy of Strahan's *The Book of Job*, or of any volume of the Great Texts of the Bible, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. More than one illustration may be sent by one person for the same text. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.